



Association of American Colleges Bulletin

VOLUME XXXIV

MARCH, 1948

NUMBER 1

Edited by

GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director of the Association

ROBERT N. DUBOSE

Assistant Editor

BERTHA TUMA

Editorial Assistant

Published by the

Association of American Colleges

N. Queen St. and McGovern Ave., Lancaster, Pa.

Editorial Offices

726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

March, May, October, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1948-49

President: Kenneth I. Brown, President, Denison University.

Vice President: Vincent J. Flynn, President, College of St. Thomas.

Treasurer: LeRoy E. Kimball, Vice Chancellor, New York University.

Executive Director: Guy E. Snavelly.

—*Executive Director Emeritis:* Robert L. Kelly, Claremont, California.

Board of Directors: (additional members) Carter Davidson, President, Union College; Alexander Guerri, President, University of the South; Winslow S. Anderson, President, Whitman College; Daniel L. Marsh, President, Boston University.

STANDING COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE: President John W. Nason, Swarthmore College, *Chairman*; President Rufus E. Clement, Atlanta University; President Charles W. Cole, Amherst College; President Francis E. Corkery, Gonzaga University; President Harwell G. Davis, Howard College; President Thomas E. Jones, Earlham College; President Weir C. Ketler, Grove City College; President Bessie C. Randolph, Hollins College; President Samuel N. Stevens, Grinnell College; President George R. Stuart, Jr., Birmingham-Southern College.

COMMISSION ON THE ARTS: Chancellor R. H. Fitzgerald, University of Pittsburgh, *Chairman*; President Helen D. Bragdon, Lake Erie College; President J. R. Cunningham, Davidson College; President Fred D. Fagg, Jr., University of Southern California; President Laurence M. Gould, Carleton College; Sister M. Helene, Siena Heights College; President Theodore H. Jack, Randolph Macon Woman's College; President Umphrey Lee, Southern Methodist University; President E. Wilson Lyon, Pomona College; President J. E. Walters, Alfred University.

COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION: President A. R. Keppel, Catawba College, *Chairman*; President Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Mount Mary College; President C. M. Granskou, St. Olaf College; President Benjamin E. Mays, Morehouse College; Harry T. Stock, Division of Christian Education, Congregational Christian Churches; President Kenneth I. Brown, Denison University; President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas; John O. Gross, Board of Education, Methodist Church; President Ralph W. Lloyd, Maryville College; President Levering Tyson, Muhlenberg College; President Hunter B. Blakely, Queens College; President Malcolm Boyd Dana, Olivet College; Robert Gibson, United Presbyterian Board of Education; President Raymond McLain, Transylvania College; President William J. Millor, University of Detroit; Robert N. DuBose, *Executive Secretary*.

COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES: Dean Mark Ingraham, University of Wisconsin, *Chairman*; President Everett N. Case, Colgate Univer-

General
Direct

LB
2301

• A 84

sity; President A. M. Lloyd, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association; President Francis L. Meade, Niagara University; Dean O. H. Rechar, University of Wyoming; President William E. Stevenson, Oberlin College.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS: Director B. M. Cherrington, University of Denver, *Chairman*; President B. F. Ashe, University of Miami; Paul J. Braisted, Hazen Foundation; President Mary Ashby Cheek, Rockford College; Dean Margaret T. Corwin, New Jersey College for Women; President R. G. Gustavson, University of Nebraska; President Virgil M. Hancher, State University of Iowa; President Francis S. Hutchins, Berea College; President Ralph C. Hutchison, Lafayette College; Rector P. J. McCormick, Catholic University of America; President Robert L. Stearns, University of Colorado; President Charles J. Turck, Macalester College; President Arthur G. Coons, Occidental College.

COMMISSION ON LIBERAL EDUCATION: President Gordon K. Chalmers, Kenyon College, *Chairman*; President James P. Baxter, III, Williams College; President B. Harvie Branscomb, Vanderbilt University; President Victor L. Butterfield, Wesleyan University; Dean William C. DeVane, Yale University; Allan P. Farrell, Assistant Editor, *America*; Senator Christian Gauss, Phi Beta Kappa; President Paul Swain Havens, Wilson College; President Mordecai W. Johnson, Howard University; Director Cornelius Krusé, American Council of Learned Societies; President Howard F. Lowry, College of Wooster; Dean T. R. McConnell, University of Minnesota; President Nathan M. Pusey, Lawrence College; President George N. Shuster, Hunter College; Denhan Sutcliffe, *Secretary*.

COMMISSION ON PUBLIC RELATIONS: President Raymond Walters, University of Cincinnati, *Chairman*; President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University; Director Frederick Hochwalt, National Catholic Educational Association; President Robert L. Johnson, Temple University; President Cloyd H. Marvin, George Washington University; Director Kathryn McHale, American Association of University Women; President Levering Tyson, Muhlenberg College.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION: President W. W. Whitehouse, Albion College, *Chairman*; Sister Annette, College of St. Catherine; President Lyndon O. Brown, Knox College; President Russell Cole, Cornell College; President Theodore A. Distler, Franklin and Marshall College; Ben Frazier, U. S. Office of Education; President L. H. Hubbard, Texas State College for Women; President Martha B. Lucas, Sweetbriar College; President Harry K. Newburn, University of Oregon; Dean Charles H. Thompson, Howard University; Chancellor John Davis Williams, University of Mississippi.

REPRESENTATIVES ON AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: President James P. Baxter, III, Williams College (one year); President Charles J. Turck, Macalester College (two years); President Mildred McAfee Horton, Wellesley College (three years).

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS: The President, *ex officio*; The Vice-President, *ex officio*; The Executive Director, *ex officio*.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Presidential Address, <i>Mildred McAfee Horton</i>	5
Maintaining High Quality in the Colleges, <i>Oliver C. Carmichael</i>	15
Colleges for Freedom, <i>John K. Mussio</i>	21
Religion and Higher Education, <i>Ralph W. Sockman</i>	35
The Integrated Preparedness Program, <i>Harold W. Dodds</i>	47
Universal Military Training, <i>Alexander Guerry</i>	60
THE AMERICAN COLLEGE AND UNESCO	
UNESCO, <i>Laurence Duggan</i>	68
The American College and UNESCO, <i>Francis S. Hutchins</i>	75
Pending Legislation, <i>Ben M. Cherrington</i>	78
CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION	
Toward "Higher" Education, <i>A. E. Keppel</i>	82
The Intellectual's Crisis in Religion, <i>Harold A. Bosley</i>	87
Trends and Tasks, <i>Gould Wickey</i>	98
PUBLIC RELATIONS	
Symposium on Public Relations, <i>Raymond Walters</i>	104
The Press and Higher Education, <i>Benjamin Fine</i>	108
Higher Education and Public Relations, <i>Dwight B. Herrick</i>	113
Public Relations Through Service, <i>Arthur L. Brandon</i>	118
THE ACTIVITIES OF THE YEAR	
Report of Executive Director, <i>Guy E. Snavelly</i>	123
Report of Board of Directors	129
Report of Treasurer, <i>LeRoy E. Kimball</i>	136
Report of Commission on the Arts, <i>E. H. Fitzgerald</i>	140
Report of Committee on Insurance and Annuities, <i>Mark H. Ingraham</i>	142
Report of Commission on Liberal Education, <i>Gordon K. Chalmers</i>	144
Report of Commission on Teacher Education, <i>William W. Whitehouse</i>	146
Report of Committee on Minority Groups in Higher Education, <i>William P. Tolley</i>	150
Report of Committee on National Scholarship Program, <i>Leonard Carmichael</i>	156
Report of American Conference of Academic Deans, <i>Ruth L. Higgins</i>	158
THE OFFICIAL RECORDS	
Minutes of the Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting	160
Members of the Association	172
Constitution and By-Laws	190
Former Presidents of the Association	194
Editorial Notes	195
Among the Colleges	202
New College Presidents	206

The BULLETIN is published four times a year—in March, May, October and December. Its emphasis is on description and exposition, not primarily on criticism or controversy. The March issue regularly carries the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association. Leaders in the college world contribute to every issue.

Annual Subscription Rates: Regular \$3.00; to members of Association colleges special rates are offered: individual subscriptions, \$1.00; ten or more club subscriptions, mailed in one package for distribution at the college, 50 cents each. Address the Association of American Colleges, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

MILDRED MCAFEE HORTON

PRESIDENT, WELLESLEY COLLEGE

MOST of the members of this audience are college presidents. Most of you saw the September issue of *Christian Education*, and if you happened to see Dr. Grenville Kleiser's description of a clergyman's requirements you shared my assurance that he must have been thinking of those clergymen who were the original college presidents. Surely men and women in our positions should have

The innocence of a lamb.
The wisdom of an owl.
The cheerfulness of a cricket.
The friendliness of a squirrel.
The complacency of a camel.
The adaptability of a chameleon.
The diligence of a beaver.
The vision of an eagle.
The patience of an ox.
The endurance of an elephant.
The tenacity of a bull-dog.
The courage of a lion.

There are those, undoubtedly, who would liken college presidents to this menagerie but would select for some of us other attributes, not "the innocence of a lamb," but its fuzziness; not "the wisdom of an owl," but its sleepy look or its monotonous hooting; not "the cheerfulness of a cricket" on the hearth, but its frequent appearance on a hot spot; not "the friendliness of a squirrel" but its acquisitive nature; not "the complacency of a camel" but its haughty air; not "the adaptability of a chameleon" but its capacity for being undistinguished; not "the diligence of a beaver" but its eager-beaver-ishness; not "the vision of the eagle" but what the *New Yorker* (Dec. 20, 1947) included in its "Talk of the Town" the week before Christmas:

Note to be brought to the attention of the House Committee on Un-Ornithological Activities: . . . The Buffalo zoo . . . displays a sign reading "This eagle never fishes for himself if he can rob the more skillful and industrious fish-hawk. The bald eagle is our national emblem."

Not "the patience of an ox" but its brute force; not "the endurance of an elephant" but its thick skin; not "the tenacity of a bull-dog" but its fierce appearance; not "the courage of a lion" but its ominous roar.

Any one of these alternative descriptions could be a text for worthy sentiments. In the light of a year's experience as the President of this Association I have chosen to plead for three of them to safeguard American education from a threatening inadequacy. I say "threatening" because I do not believe colleges deserve to be called inadequate.

Certainly this is not the place to waste time defending the institutions to which you are giving your "last full measure of devotion." I have inserted this paragraph, however, to safeguard myself from the charge of undue criticism of our educational system, especially at the point I know best, the liberal arts college. If I did not believe in it with sincere conviction I should certainly not be pounding the pavements with 99 and 99/100% of all the rest of you, seeking money to sustain and strengthen one of them.

I am apprehensive about the threat to American education inherent in its beaver-traits. How frequently the beaver's diligence is matched by another familiar quality! We all have "eager beavers" on our campuses. Educational agencies show some of the traits.

A great gift of American education is its diversity but we have allowed that diversity to run over into divisions which thwart unity. I recall a meeting in Washington long before the war, my first contact with a federal government commission and with the wheels within wheels in national educational organizations. A large group was convened to discuss education's part in meeting the world emergency which ultimately developed into war. It had to be a large group because nobody could be omitted without having the feelings of scores of people hurt! When it came to action the executive committee had to have three co-chairmen, as I recall it, and I think it was Sidney Hillman who remarked that labor was frequently criticized for not being unified but it had no divisions compared to education's.

I wish there might be a careful definition of function of the numerous national organizations to which our member colleges

belong to see if we could not curtail duplicating functions. Individual colleges periodically re-evaluate their machinery by establishing a committee to study and reorganize committees. I wish we could go into the same kind of simplification of existing agencies with equal willingness to yield jurisdiction when necessary. Do you wonder the UN cannot perform miracles of cooperation when we find it so hard to yield sovereignty in the educational world?

Military Training, Federal Aid, Discrimination, UNESCO, and all the rest. We all work at it and we duplicate and overlap and sometimes come out with conflicting, unresolved differences, and are busy, busy, busy in our own back yards instead of diligently cooperating like the busy—not eager—beaver. My desk—and yours—is piled high with bulletins, monthlies, weeklies—and those exhausting multigraphed, mimeographed, lithographed, masses of matter over which somebody has faithfully slaved. Without the slightest hope of receiving a favorable reply, I ask you, Is it all necessary? My only practical suggestion would be the appointment of a committee, but I am reminded that it, too, would produce a monumental report to add to the appalling pile beside which I labor day after day. Seriously, are we college educators not the victims of the same type of jurisdictional dispute which we so deplore elsewhere in American society?

If we would ape the beaver I wish we would imitate his diligence rather than his persistent busyness.

I am apprehensive about a threatened capacity for being fuzzy in our thinking as we claim a lamb's innocence.

Nothing concerns a college president more than the problem of financing higher education unless it be the war and postwar task of re-evaluating our programs. The two are obviously closely related since the effort to meet financial demands keeps college presidents so peripatetic that they hardly know what happens on the campus. I am entranced by Dean French's definition of a Dean as that officer who tries to make the college half as good as the President says it is.

A careful study of what really happens to students seems to me important as it relates to our financial situation for I am convinced that the liberal arts college depends essentially on the reputation of its graduates for the public support—voluntary

through gifts or involuntary through taxes—which we all need. It seems to me both naively innocent and intellectually fuzzy to think we can maintain a tax exempt status or gain federal or state or private funds without demonstrating the production of something so valuable that society would provide it as an essential to its well-being if we should stop doing it.

What are we really doing?

(a) Perhaps we are discovering new truth about the world in which we live. We believe that to be public service of a high order. Are we doing it? More than others? Occasionally a few bits are added to factual information even outside the great technological institutions. Is there enough to justify our tax exemption?

(b) Are we pointing up new applications of truth? That, too, is public service of a high order. Are we doing it more than industry, research institutes, etc.?

(c) Are we training young people equipped to render public service and eager to do so? I think so. If so, a country which pays young people to study how to become officers in the Army, Navy, and Air Force would seem justified in exempting from taxation those institutions which are training other types of public servant.

What are the distinguishing features of such public servants? Certainly they include government participation and a concern for society's well-being as preferred to self-centered ambition. In proportion to their total number, are college men and women proving to be the kind of citizen the world needs today? Are they what they are *because* of their college experience or in spite of it? These questions must be answered if we would maintain our position as tax exempt institutions.

Colleges are in an obviously difficult position in producing citizens. If they train them to fit easily into established patterns of society there is a fair question as to whether or not they contribute more than the man who learns by personal rather than vicarious experience. If colleges take the lead in training for *advancement* of social programs they run the risk of defying popular conventions and producing citizens out of step with today's powerful forces. At this point the role of the scholar is difficult but most productive.

Even the so-called man on the street expects his educated friend to have a perspective different from that he would have without education. But the young college graduate faces the probability that his different attitude will mark him off from the rest of his contemporaries, than which there is no torture more exquisite to the young. What does he do? He has two strong temptations. One is to seek out contemporaries of like mind and become in effect an intellectual snob, enjoying his own superiority as a compensation for his failure to fit into ordinary society.

He may choose to yield to another temptation. He discovers that his uneducated friends are keeping the world in action and are having a right good time in the process. He is tempted, therefore, to become one of the crowd, pigeonholing his adventurous intellectual activity which seems out of line with the ordinary activity of his contemporaries. He becomes a good fellow, a little tiny bit more daring than his untutored friend perhaps, but basically one with him in his social practices. So what has society gained from its investment in that man?

To the extent that our graduates yield to these temptations we have failed them and the society of which they are and must be a part. Surely intellectual snobbery is a travesty on true scholarship but in emphasizing the importance of scholarship we run a risk in any academic institution of minimizing the importance of "know-how." An understanding of principles of government which leaves the student feeling wholly superior to the practical politician used to be stylish. I hope it is forever obsolete in college communities. The economic theory which repudiates father's industrial practice without evaluating its creditable features contributes to a combination of intellectual snobbery and graduate futility, or encourages the repudiation of college-cultivated attitudes when experience produces the credit factor in father's business.

What I urge us to reconsider in our educational practice is that nice balance between recognition of existing values and practices and an alluring presentation of a better way, the direction in which to move from the point at which society now is. Thus the college needs to teach the internationalism which is the forward looking attitude of society, without minimizing the virtue

of local citizenship. Students rally eagerly to the appeal of UNESCO, they flock to work camps in Europe, they welcome national organization with a view to having an American place in the world program of students. We have taught this reasonably well. Have we related it effectually to town government, to ward politics, to less glamorous local activities?

Perhaps I am asking the colleges to produce effective liberals, men and women free of prejudice so that they respect their fellow men in sincerity and truth, free of ignorance so that they know the real world with which they must cope, free of complacency so that they throw themselves zealously and cooperatively into the production of a better world.

Freedom from prejudice, freedom from ignorance, freedom from complacency. Such freedom depends upon minds disciplined enough to be controllable and therefore really free.

A college of liberal arts does not guarantee to teach its students the tricks of many trades, but it does undertake to train them in the art of thinking. Their mastery of that art will give them a chance at freedom, for it will give them minds free to be used intentionally and intelligently, not to be manipulated unwittingly and unwillingly.

Thinking in the abstract is not the kind of thought which is in most demand. Society wants people equipped to apply their minds to problems of immediate concern. A secondary function of all colleges, the primary one in some, is to introduce students to those areas of experience in which problems are waiting to be solved—and that can mean any aspect of life. Moreover, it has become the task of the college to replace in college the motivation which used to bring people into institutions of higher education. First a boy decided to be a minister or a girl a teacher. Then they went to college. Now they go to college and expect to learn there the use to which their trained minds can be put. This means that the college can no longer take for granted the professional motivation of its constituency. It has not been possible for years, but much of college work assumed that it was there. The influx of veterans has helped to make it plain that one task has to be the directing of student attention to work to be done by people with trained minds.

Thus the colleges are proposing—indeed, they are already

undertaking—to provide society with workers, trained to think and interested in applying their minds to the problems of their day. In this kind of production, as in all others, there are some less than perfect units produced. I believe they are called “seconds” in manufacture. Colleges have their “seconds,” too, and we present them with little pride, though with the haunting conviction that they are more useful than they would have been without the processing they got in college. But the men and women who come out of college with the real ability to think and think straight—they are the free men and women whom we want to advertise. They have the freedom which comes with the sense of mastery, of ability to take what comes and deal with it as it arises. They do not claim to know all the answers but they have been sensitized to know what phases of social life need to have thought put upon them.

It is never hard to find students excited about labor relations, about international affairs. I think the basic reason for that is that these are areas of great unsolved problems which excite the imagination of people who want to use their minds where they will count for something.

And so the colleges profess to be public servants, agencies which render real service to their day and age. They are not educating young people for the sake of those particular individuals. They are educating them for the sake of the society of which they are a part. The higher the institution, the wider the horizons toward which it can direct the attention of its students.

The colleges can make no legitimate claim on public funds if they are merely places for boys and girls to have a good time, or even places where they can learn to get rich quick by fleecing the public. They can and do claim public support when they provide society with the essential element in a free society, free men and women, graced with the freedom which comes from disciplined minds. The production of such citizens is not a luxury. It is the basic need of a nation making a great adventure in trying to function by the cooperative agreement of its free citizens. We need more and more people trained to think fast, to care about thinking and about applying their thought to current problems of immediate concern. We cannot afford to

fritter away our time in this momentous period, and the colleges offer themselves as instruments for the production of increasingly large numbers of men and women trained to save time by thinking first and then acting.

Accomplishing this requires well adjusted faculty members, not embittered by lack of social approbation, not boastful of too much prestige. The scholar is vitally important to modern life as he supplies perspective and insight into its problems. He merits more money than most of them get (though I must say, the small college is now in a bad bargaining position with the major universities). This is the point at which I could easily go into my fund appeal on behalf of faculty salaries. I'll divert myself just long enough to tell the story I heard told in England last summer by a minister who had been visiting in America. He told of a plumber at work in a minister's study who fell into conversation with the minister who asked about the plumber's family. The plumber told with pride of his daughter's graduation from college and then added, "She has a good job, too, teaching. She has a good salary, too, for an educated girl." I return to my point—

The scholar should be freed from the necessity of using his essential leisure in self-defensive trade union activities. He is a man first and merits human recognition and will naturally demand it if he does not have it without demand, but as a scholar he has more important things to do than bargaining for his rights. A major function of administration might be said to be that of providing those rights so that the scholar can do his unique task. But that task needs to be related to significance. Society has a right to expect of him a contribution of importance to the thinking of his day. He cannot train citizens worthy of tax exemption if he has lost his own perspective. The minutiae of a discipline may seem irrelevant to outsiders, while being the breath of life to the teacher. However, the scholar who would train effective citizens must see beyond minutiae to their significance in understanding of some important phase of truth. It is not his responsibility to apply his learning to a practical problem but it behooves him to respect the man who relates his discovery to immediacy. There is no special virtue in impracticality and our liberal scholars have long realized that fact. If colleges would

be free of taxation they must be productive of free men and women, inspired for intelligent participation in their communities by contact with scholars who are truly free.

If we would ape the lamb, let us be innocent of self-defensive self-interest, not fuzzy in our thinking about our claim on a favored position.

Most of all I plead for the wisdom of the owl and the courage of the lion instead of the hooting of the owl and roaring of the lion. We are considering at this conference the responsibility of the colleges for eliminating racial and religious tensions in American and world society. There is no topic more tempting for hooting and roaring. We can declaim—or perform. We need both, but never the first without the second. In my opinion the liberal colleges are blameworthy for their slowness in recognizing the fact of race prejudice in the American scene as a denial of the very values they purport to foster. No college represented here fails, I suppose, to offer courses in sociology, psychology, or anthropology, in which students learn that to the extent that there are racial differences they are structural and not inherently functional. We all *know* intellectually that ideological differences are socially acquired and are not products of inevitable and unchangeable traits of racial or national groups. *Cultural* attitudes of national or racial groups are *culturally* acquired. Russians are difficult for us to understand, not because of an inborn Russian character, transmitted through a germ plasm, but because of a particular combination of historic and geographical circumstances. This does not solve the problem of relationships between groups but it does alter the assumptions about the way to deal with them. But what have our educated men and women done to clarify the problems of group relationships, domestic and foreign? Too many college trained men and women have acquiesced in segregation, exclusion, under-privilege. They have tolerated a situation which is now producing the insistent demands of frustrated minorities for their fair place in the body politic, a place recognized as fair by such a fair-minded group as the President's Commission on Civil Rights and his Commission on Higher Education. We may disagree about the methods now proposed for righting these wrongs. We have lacked the wisdom of the owl in applying our knowledge

of group relations to actual situations and should now have the courage of the lion in admitting our share of responsibility for the condition and our determination to do something positive about it. In my personal opinion legislative control of educational institutions is not the best way to accomplish our educational task in connection with fair practice in American society, but my objection is to method and not to purpose. An institution which teaches the fallacy of racial superiority and corresponding inferiority seems to me obligated to send out citizens prepared to act as though that teaching were true. Each one of us may need to do it in a unique fashion adapted to our own constituency but it seems to me a place where we need wisdom and courage in accepting responsibility.

Lambs, beavers, owls, lions. A zoo-full of animals cannot summarize what the world now demands of education. Society does not ask for the qualities of the beasts with their inevitable ambivalence. It asks for the humane and divine qualities which the Jewish-Christian heritage has led us to associate with man. Our colleges maintain in the American scene the emphasis on humanistic values. Most of them relate those values to a conception of man as made in the image of God. The conviction that free men have access to the power which governs the very universe may be the greatest strength we can supply students for these turbulent times.

Released from the limitation of finite power man can face serenely as terrifying and bewildering a future as we all anticipate. Bombs bursting in air, on land and in the sea? Wars being created in the minds of men? Who knows? But *this* we know: that if man, kin to savage beast can act with bestial hate and force, man kin to God can choose to act with power to heal and bind together a world's wounds.

May we who know man's greatness through the years be satisfied with nothing small today.

MAINTAINING HIGH QUALITY IN THE COLLEGES

OLIVER C. CARMICHAEL

PRESIDENT, CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

HIGHER education in the United States is undergoing the severest test in its history. With a shortage of well qualified staff and a student body far larger than the physical plant can accommodate adequately, the task of maintaining acceptable standards is well nigh overwhelming. Add to that the fact of a million GI's with greater maturity and earnestness and with far wider experience than college students of any other generation have had, and the nature of the test to which higher education is being subjected becomes clear.

One need not elaborate on the difficulties of finding a faculty for a student body 1,000,000 larger than the highest prewar enrolment or of providing the class rooms, libraries and laboratories and housing for this vast horde. They are already well known to the American public and painfully known to this audience of college administrators. What might be useful is a brief analysis of the dangers that beset the path of progress and of the means of avoiding the pitfalls that may not be obvious in these trying times.

The teacher is carrying the heaviest burden and the largest responsibility for the effectiveness of higher education. An increased teaching load in terms of hours and of much larger classes than formerly means a more difficult instructional job than college faculties have ever before undertaken. But this is not the whole story. Students of varying ages and backgrounds who throng the classrooms present a difficulty of fitting instruction to individual needs that is unique. Couple with this the obvious but often overlooked fact that *teaching* is the measure of the quality of education in any institution and you see at once the strategic role which the teacher has to play in meeting successfully the test which faces higher education.

Every college administration should take a new look at what is being done to insure that the faculty is kept fresh and alert. The deadening effect of impossible teaching loads with all the paper work which double sized classes entails is in danger of be-

ing overlooked. Though there has been real concern about faculty salaries and some progress made toward improving them, no similar concern has been expressed over the equally distressing problem of providing opportunity for relieving the faculty at intervals for their own study and research and for replenishing their enthusiasm and energy so necessary to successful classroom performance. It is my conviction that this is the number one problem in American colleges and universities today, and that if it is properly solved the cornerstone will be laid for maintaining and improving the quality of higher education in this country.

To sustain this thesis it is necessary to sketch briefly some of the more fundamental goals which education must achieve if it is to meet its obligation to society in these times, and to indicate the primary responsibility of the faculty in achieving them. This requires some consideration of the particular needs of our generation. We cannot ignore the fact that we are living in one of the great transition periods of history, similar in more respects than one to the Renaissance and Reformation, and that America has suddenly been catapulted into a position of leadership for which our previous experience has not fitted us. These two central facts must affect our concepts of education, particularly higher education, and its responsibilities to our day and generation. They suggest the points of emphasis that particularly need to be stressed, namely the values in the heritage of Western Civilization and the strategic role which America is called on to play in establishing international cooperation and security.

The debate going on in the world today between democracy and communism is one of the historic debates of the centuries. The ideals towards which Western Civilization has been striving for two thousand years are declared to be not only false but a failure. They are being openly and defiantly attacked from within and from without the western democracies. The conflict is bitter, the tactics ruthless, the outcome of the struggle by no means assured. So desperate has it become that America has already put hundreds of millions, and even now is contemplating pouring billions, of her treasure into the breach to stem the tide of reactionism and tyranny.

In the face of those facts, what are our colleges and universities doing to make clear the values of the heritage which is ours and to strengthen the convictions of our youth—the leaders of the next generation—that they are worth preserving at whatever cost? Our blood and treasure were spent unstintingly to rescue democracy and all it stands for in the most disastrous war in history. The colleges were called upon and responded nobly to the call for help in training young men for that conflict. “Cold war” has taken the place of the shooting war, the stakes are the same, namely the preservation of our liberties, the dignity of the individual, the God-given rights guaranteed by our constitution. Are the institutions playing their full part in this latter conflict?

Many of you remember as I do the historic meeting held six years ago this month when a thousand college and university presidents assembled in Baltimore to consider what they might do to assist in the prosecution of the war which had so recently been declared and to pledge the full resources of their institutions to the cause. Perhaps the emergency then was more acute than now (though that might be disputed) but I sense no similar concern to be of assistance to the nation in the present crisis. I have heard of no meeting called to consider the matter or to pledge resources. Is it possible that the colleges and universities are not sufficiently aware of what is taking place in the world or of the need for the contributions which they might make toward the successful prosecution of the “cold war” which presently grips our world!

Between 1942 and 1945 Army and Navy programs largely took the place of the regular curricula, and the faculties accomplished miracles in response to the national need. So far as I have been able to discern in the present emergency, little modification has been made of the prewar curricula in response to the challenge of “cold war.” Surely there is need for drastic changes in emphasis if not in courses of study to clarify the issues and to meet the challenge of the mighty conflict that is raging in the world today. If no congress of faculties and administrations is called to consider these problems, they should at least be given consideration on every campus in the land. Though administrations may take the lead

in this movement, in the last analysis it is the faculties that will determine what goes on in the classrooms and what the quality of the education which our youth acquires will be. This emphasizes the need of providing for the faculty new contacts, larger opportunities for self improvement, and wider horizons of opportunity and responsibility.

Closely related to the need for preparing youth to understand and to defend the ideals which undergird Western Civilization is that of giving them an understanding of the peoples of other lands, of the problems involved in making this in reality *one world*, and of inspiring in them a sense of responsibility that should attach to being a citizen of that nation which the democracies of the world look to for leadership. In meeting this responsibility the universities have shown a degree of interest that is heartening. Throughout the land a new emphasis on international studies is reflected in the announced offerings of institutions. A large number of universities have inaugurated studies designed to acquaint American youth with the language, literature, history and social, economic and political problems of various areas of the world. Russia, China, Japan, Southeast Asia, India, the Middle East and South America are among the areas already covered by these special programs. Though much remains to be done to supply the needs fully, the start which has been made is encouraging.

Curiously enough no institution seems to have established thus far a foreign institute on Europe, the one part of the world most important to us and the one on which most emphasis was placed in prewar days. Many courses are offered on European history, literature, languages, politics and economics but apparently in no institution have these been coordinated to form an area study program. The reason assigned is the difficulty of persuading professors of these subjects to merge their vested interests into single cooperative undertaking. I do not vouch for the accuracy of this statement, but if it be true, it is striking evidence of the need for an orientation of faculties which would focus attention on the needs of students rather than on subject matter fields. Again it is the faculty that is responsible for the kind of education provided. Unless it has a vision of the need and a willingness to submerge departmental

interests for the larger educational goal, student requirements will not be satisfied.

Closely allied to area studies are courses in international relations. These sprang up throughout the country between the two world wars but like the seed which fell on stony ground they did not prosper. Even now no adequate texts are available for courses in this field. Fortunately this deficiency will soon be, at least partially, filled. Under the direction of Professor Grayson Kirk of Columbia University a series of volumes is being prepared for the use of colleges and universities which wish to develop substantial courses in international relations. When these are available it is to be hoped that many institutions will undertake such programs with a view to equipping a vast body of students with a knowledge of international organization and control and of the elements necessary to world peace and security.

It is frequently suggested that a study of international relations cannot be effective unless the student has a broad understanding of other peoples and cultures, that in view of the lack of such background on the part of most students it must of necessity be superficial and, therefore, of questionable value. There is truth in that suggestion. The failure of the earlier courses in this field was partly due to the meagerness of the background of the students that took them. But this need not be true in the future. In the senior college every student should have sufficient general knowledge not only to understand the nature of the international forces at work in the world, but to comprehend their relation to the issues that make for peace and security. If our college population is not to be equipped with this knowledge and understanding, who is to exercise the leadership in the formation of public opinion necessary to the support of a sound foreign policy?

International organization, in its political, economic, legal, and sociological aspects, is a highly complex subject. To master the elements which make it up and especially to understand the implications of its many ramifications for international security would be a lifetime study. But a general knowledge of its functioning and of its bearing on the day-to-day issues which arise in our complex society ought to be a part of the

general education of all college graduates. This was not so necessary in times past for the average American student but times have changed. International organization assumes a far more important place in the world's life than formerly and the responsibilities of America have expanded to such an extent that such knowledge becomes a necessary part of the equipment of every educated person. My fear is that the full meaning of this fact has not yet dawned upon the minds of the rank and file of college faculties.

One of the difficulties in developing adequate programs in international relations, as in the development of area studies, is the fact that it does not fit neatly into the pattern of the established departmental academic order. Young faculty members of promise will be discouraged by their elders from entering a field which cross-cuts the traditional disciplines but I am confident that among the younger generation of college teachers pioneers will emerge who will in time settle the presently unknown wilderness of international studies and establish a new set of disciplines that will rival the older subjects in popularity and interest, and be even more relevant to the needs of society.

Again attention is called to the fact that reforms in education and any progress which it can hope to make must rely ultimately upon the faculty, its understanding of social needs, its initiative in undertaking to meet them, and its vision for education's role in American society. That fact emphasizes the importance of making special efforts to provide for expanding the horizon of college teachers through every possible means. Funds for research, for travel and study, for bringing stimulating leaders (educational, business and professional) to faculty meetings, and for exchange of professors between colleges and universities would pay large dividends in terms of the quality of the teaching which can be expected. It must be remembered that quality in education depends upon the teaching and that thoroughness in the *mastery of subject matter* is no less important than *relevance of subject matter* in determining the character of the educational product.

COLLEGES FOR FREEDOM

JOHN K. MUSSIO

BISHOP OF STEUBENVILLE (OHIO)

I THANK you for giving me this great privilege of addressing your esteemed Association. And I am likewise grateful to the Ordinary of this Archiepiscopal See for his graciousness in welcoming me to Cincinnati for this occasion. My limitations are such that I should surely have hesitated in accepting this most important assignment had not another consideration presented itself. I chose to accept because I wanted to show you how deeply we all appreciate the honest endeavors being made by your Association towards a better development of our youth.

The schools, today, especially the liberal arts institutions, have had thrust upon them a responsibility which in ordinary times should rest elsewhere. But these are not ordinary times. As a result of causes too numerous to mention here, the college is reaching our young people in numbers far exceeding anything recorded until now. In very many cases, the young student is placing himself entirely under the direction of his teachers, pinning his hopes for the future on his college training. Many of these young people have broken family ties, have slipped away from religious influences, giving to the school the added responsibility of preserving for them their Christian heritage and culture. The student expects from modern education the services of the parent and of the minister of God. He demands from the school that completeness which his nature requires. On his part he is giving to his books, to his professors, and to the courses offered a seriousness, an application, a maturity which perhaps is exceptional in the history of the general student body of a college. If, then, spiritual values have that important place in the life of man which is attributed to them by most of our real leaders, the schools have an opportunity and an obligation, because of their unique influence on the modern student, to help in the development of this spiritual structure in man. For this reason, I, together with your eminent speaker of the evening, Dr. Sockman, look upon this as a blessed opportunity to join with men of good will everywhere in preparing for the future a basis of real faith and hope.

Not long ago, I saw a motion picture study of carrier pigeons. These pigeons had been transported from their original base to this distant point from which they were to be released for the home flight. You could not fail to notice the nervous expectancy of the birds. Their bodies were pressed against the front of the little cages, their wings spasmodic with flutterings. Every time the keeper would approach the cages, the birds would grow quiet in tenseness. I began to feel within me that same strain of waiting. But then the time of liberation did come. Open went the little gates and for a moment the landscape was clouded by the outrushing of these pigeons. Up high into the air they flew, momentarily they stopped as though poised for action, and then, in swift, sure movement, they set their flight for home. At the same moment I felt within myself an easing of a tension that had been mine watching the plight of the imprisoned birds. But now they were free, free to go home. I really felt good. And, moreover, I realized with even greater force than before how miserable would be my plight were I imprisoned within these walls of mortal flesh with no hand to open the little gate that would send me winging my flight home.

In quite recent times we have all, I am certain, been profoundly shocked by the suicide of many quite prominent persons. Many were university trained, most of them well provided with the goods of this world. They had, moreover, attained each in his own field an enviable position. Some had distinguished themselves in the educational field, others in government, still others in the fields of finance and management. To all worldly standards, they were successful men. But then, suddenly, in the height of their success, they chose to die rather than live. Investigation could show no reason for the choice. Apparently, there were no family difficulties, the financial condition was sound, in fact, there was nothing to indicate a reason to bring about such a violent end. So, as usual, we read the stock forms—worry, sickness, strain. But I wonder. I wonder if for them there was found no hand to open the little gate to freedom.

We must remember that man, left to himself, is a lonely little creature. In all the universe, he is the one who has not his completion here. The inferior creatures are moved by a superior, they have their definite work, a goal. And in achieving the end

to which they are ordered, they themselves are destroyed. But they are, if I may so use the word, satisfied. Their work is done and the doing of that work has kept them engrossed. Man alone has no superior in the universe. He is, as he has been called, a "lonely sovereign." He is at the top and quite often this pinnacle is a very empty, desolate place. If man is to discover his end, his real work, his purpose, he must look to God. But, in contrast to all other creatures of the universe, man in achieving his end is not destroyed but perfected. Once, however, God is eliminated from the plan, then truly man is alone, with no place to go, nothing worthwhile to do, his wings are shackled and the thoughts of his spirit made a mockery. Without God man is imprisoned within himself and he soon finds this imprisonment intolerable.

Little more than seven years ago, on January 6, 1941, the late President Roosevelt, in his Message to the 77th Congress on the State of the Union, spoke of freedom in terms which the world shall remember as the "four freedoms." At the same time, the President voiced his hope for a world in the future founded on a "moral order," an order under the guidance of God. Were we not a bit shocked to think that we had to form a new order, a moral order, when we thought we had been living in the best possible world! But World War I and World War II, and the rumors of a World War III, brought the truth crashing about us. We had failed in preserving that great order based upon the four freedoms. What went wrong? Why should that for which the great mass of people truly hunger be so far removed from them? Had they been misled by their leaders? Or had they taken for granted these truths, thus weakening their resistance to error, softening their defenses against the inroads of totalitarianism, blinding them to the warnings of a few awakened leaders who could see the dangerous implications of this complacency. At any rate, here was a generation of men, many university graduates, men trained in the best our culture and civilization could offer, who had to be urged to form a new order, a moral order based on the four essential freedoms. How else could this appeal be interpreted, save as a rebuke to all who had made any contribution whatsoever to the formation of the generation. And it was, also, a ringing challenge.

The challenge was accepted. UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, was the education world's response to this challenge. The four freedoms were translated into educational terms in the UNESCO Charter. In this Charter we read:

The governments of the States, parties to this Constitution, on behalf of their people declare: that the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace, are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfill in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern.

After this declaration of high principle, the Charter declared further:

... the States, parties to this Constitution, believe in full and equal opportunities for education of all, in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth.

With the enunciation of these high aims and purposes, with the statement of our championing as a nation the four freedoms, the heart of a weary, discouraged world was really lifted up. And especially in our own country were these pronouncements met with something more than a passing interest, for the words, "Freedom," "Moral Order," "Education for Justice," "Unrestricted pursuit of objective truth," struck a chord deep within the make-up of man. This program had to succeed. Otherwise, only despair would be the heritage of the offspring of tomorrow.

And yet today, all of these high-sounding words of the four freedoms and the UNESCO Charter have a hollow ring. Perhaps a few wanted to scuttle the whole plan in order that they might profit by the ensuing confusion and despair to set up their own little dictatorship. But I do believe that the great majority of men were truly interested, sincerely wanted to establish this new order. Where, then, did they fail? Why are so many today becoming cynical to the very idea of putting into practice the high principles enunciated not so long ago? Quite evidently everyone concerned has made mistakes of commission and omission. On the part of educators, perhaps, the fault lies in that they have failed to think through the real meaning of freedom and its implications for education. And, without a clear and true understanding of these salient points, there can be no real start towards the formation of this new order. Real freedom

must release man from his prison by showing him the divine love beyond the last curve of space. If it turns out in practice that what was called freedom is but another bar put against the prison door, then anger, resentment, confusion, and final despair will mark the citizen of today.

I feel acutely my limitations, my inability to place before you forcibly and adequately the great solution of our problem which we must accept. My prayer is that God will supply where I fail and that you who are so well-disposed, and likewise skilled in the educational process, will receive the grace given you to understand and then to carry out fearlessly the program of real freedom.

Now, first of all, the truth about man is the key to real freedom. The Scriptures tell us:

You shall know the Truth and the Truth shall make you free.

Many, with Pilate, ask, "What is the truth?" and then walk away, afraid to hear the answer. But, unlike Pilate, the sincere man must seek a clear understanding of this truth of man. Truth is not something that changes with each new fashion of thought; it is not a handmaid to statescraft, nor does it dance to the tune of man's changing fancy. Rather, it is as basic and immutable as God. For the truth of a thing is simply that thing as God sees it. Everything has its place in the plan of the Creator. He made all things for His divine purpose and nothing that was made did not have its blueprint. And so, everything that God freely created was fashioned on the model of the divine ideas, the eternal blueprint. Truth is but the adequate correspondence of things with God's plan. And the truth which results from human knowledge is but a reflection of the truth manifest by God in His works. We may say, then, that:

Truth resides, in the first place, in the Divine Intelligence, which eternally conceives the Idea of His works. It belongs, in the second place, to things in so far as they are realized in conformity with their eternal archetypal ideas. And finally, it passes from things into human knowledge as soon as the mind represents to itself things as they are.

Now what is the truth of man? You do not truly know what anything is until you know what it is for. Complete knowledge

demands a knowledge of purpose. And the perfect way to know the purpose of anything is to find out from its maker. The Creator has manifested His eternal wisdom to man in two ways. First, He has done so through the works of creation, which truth man can know by use of reason. This is the way of philosophy. Secondly, He does this through divine revelation, especially through Jesus Christ. And this is the way of theology. And so, a partial knowledge of the truths of revelation can be known by human reason, but a more extensive and intimate knowledge is gained by faith in the authority of God's truth. It is, then, through philosophy and theology that we know the truth of man, that we can see the divine blueprint of man. And what a sublime truth it is. God created man to know, love and serve Him in earthly life and to be happy with him in the next. This man is composed of body and soul joined in a substantial union. Man is governed by the natural law which obliges him, as well as all other created beings, to act according to his essential nature. Man is endowed by his Creator with an intellect by which he can know the truth and a free will by which he can embrace and follow it. Man is responsible for his conduct in regard to his God, his neighbor and himself. He must conform his conduct to the eternal norms of the moral law which exists outside of him and is obligatory on him. It is unchanging and hence not affected by social changes of any sort. Now, as we have said before, God gave man the power to learn certain of these truths in the natural order; and God has revealed to man certain other truths in the supernatural order, which truths, unless divinely revealed, would be unknown to man. These truths are not found in the fields of science, sociology, economics, nor in any of the false materialistic philosophies rampant today. They are found in the truths of real philosophy and divine revelation.

This then is man, a creature made by God and made for God. And what is more, God created man to His own image and likeness. The highest faculties of man are geared only to God. The intellect has as its proper object the Truth, which is God; the will has for its proper object the Good, which is God. Nothing else can satisfy, nothing else can give completion. This is home for man—this union with God. Made for God, everything within man is straining for God, nothing is provided in the higher facul-

ties of man which will be satisfied with anything less than contemplating the Infinite and possessing the Divine. Man's peace can come only when everything within himself is working harmoniously according to that order and purpose set up in him by his Maker.

It seems fairly reasonable, then, to say that man wants nothing more than to be able to act in agreement with his nature. He wants to reach beatitude, to rest in the possession of the True Good. This is the freedom he wants. Freedom for man means the power to work in conformity with his God-given nature. It means a moral power, a power of choosing. In a physical way a man is free to choose evil, that is, what is against his nature. A man can damn himself, choose what really separates him from his last end, his God. But then, he does not act as a man but as a fool, unreasonably. The will is not morally free, for man is responsible for his conduct. Freedom, then, means the ability to do what one ought to do, to do what is right, just, lawful, and to avoid what is evil. It is unhampered action according to the divine blueprint. In his book, "Tradition and Progress," Hoffman writes:

Freedom is a subjective conception. It designates a consciousness in us of what we are, an inner illumination of our nature whereby we know ourselves as moral agents, able to discern right and wrong, and to exercise the power of moral choice . . . freedom can be had only by men who know what kind of creatures God fashioned them to be.

In the very closing line of this quotation, we catch a glimmer of that Truth which shall make us free. Freedom represents the perfection of our nature and hence will have no part of anarchy. To say that because we are free we can do anything we please is to misunderstand freedom and to practice its abuse. Freedom is directed in application by moral and religious principles, it has a moral foundation. It is founded on eternal truths. A truly free man exercises his power in conformity to the natural law which is God's imprint on human nature. "The light of Thy countenance, O Lord, is signed upon us" (Ps. IV, 7). Freedom, consequently, depends on obedience to law and can exist only within the law. Pope Leo XIII taught that:

Nothing more foolish can be uttered or conceived than the notion that because man is free by nature, he is therefore

exempt from law. Were this the case it would follow that to become free we must be deprived of reason; whereas the truth is that we are bound to submit to law precisely because we are free by our very nature.

From this, we see how intimately freedom is joined to God's will in man's behalf. For man must attain his destined end under the authority of law or he will fail. How are you free to go home until you know what home is and where?

Man's spiritual eyes, then, were made to look beyond the world's limits. There is no resting place in the created world for the soul of man. Nothing here can really satisfy his hunger. And so it is that if we are to realize the fullness of our calling, "our actions, all of them, must be steeped in divine truth, dyed with the divinity which is their end; otherwise they are disastrously against all we are living for." It really is not so difficult to realize the hopeless condition of a soul made for the fullness of union with God when that soul is confined, through a false philosophy, within the limits of material horizons. Father Walter Farrell, O.P., has deftly drawn the picture of such a man:

This is the hopeless man whose desires are limited to a few hours, a few months, a few years, to the things he can see and touch, to narrow limits of natural life, of personal accomplishments, of human faith, of the security to be had in this present world. This is the hopeless man whose love has been limited as has his desire. It is the love of a machine, of an animal, or at best, the love of a man. At its best, it is doomed to frustration from the very start; it grows in perfection only to lose the things it loved; it stops at the walls of the world, shrinks in horror from sickness, brings up short before the barrier of death. It is the love of the slave; the love of the hour that dare not look ahead because of what the future holds for it. The heart has no place to go, yet it was made to go to sublime places, even into the hearts of other men and other women, even into the heart of God. But now, without hope, it is chained down.

And this is exactly what modern philosophies which pander to materialism in one form or another are doing to man. For when they confine his mind and heart within the limits of the tangible, or bind them by things that can be demonstrated, or even worse, by things which are purely fictitious, then we have real slavery. And this slavery leads to despair. For what is there left for a

man when they have chained his heart, and destroyed his hope? He was made for distant horizons. If he who was made for God is forced within the straitjacket of the material universe, then there is a disordination which results in a slavery unholy to look upon. Such a man may be at liberty to go from place to place in this world, he can travel and see many things, he can exult in his democratic way of life and fondle his liberty and freedom; he can build up a great reputation by his prowess in the physical sciences. But his heart is in bondage, and when he looks at the end of it all, he knows he has been but fooling himself. For the frankness of death makes foolish things look foolish.

What, then, will free a man, what will open the little gate and give flight to his soul? The answer is supernatural faith. For a man by himself is a prisoner of his own nature. His nature cannot surpass the powers of nature. Only someone above nature can give us the freedom of eternity, only through God's eyes can we pierce the darkness before us. And God does this for us through the virtue of faith.

Faith points out to man his distant home. How can we travel the road without knowing the destination? And when, through faith, we learn that the end of the road is the very essence of God, then we can better understand how the soul is freed to wing its flight far past the last bastions of this universe. As it has been so beautifully expressed: "By faith man's mind walks into the limitlessness of God." Faith lets us see what we ourselves could not see, it is like a flashlight which suddenly shows the path, the open door, the loved one waiting.

Now we do not accept this faith just because we want something to ease the hurt of our confinement. For this would be just an opiate which, wearing off, would leave us in a worse condition than before. We accept the supernatural truth on the authority of God, who is Truth itself. Submitting to such an authority is not an insult to our own dignity, but rather a guarantee that trusting ourselves to God, we shall not stumble and fall. In faith, then, lies our salvation. We must humble ourselves, to reach our full stature as men, accept the truth because God says it is so, and treasure that Truth with our very lives. For this faith is our life.

There are some, however, who cannot bring themselves to take

God's hand and be directed. To them, freedom is ridding themselves of God. First of all, consider Hegel's idea of freedom. He gave inspiration to a type of freedom which was brought to the peak of expression by Hitler. It simply meant the freedom of a man to do what the State told him to do, to talk as the State ordered him to talk, to think as the State manufactured his ideas. It is the kind of freedom a man might have after resigning himself to chains. Hegel didn't like the idea of man being led by God to life; he preferred man's march to death in the State. Here is the core of the error in this system—the State is made the god of man, it is the final end of man's striving, it is the norm of right and wrong, the ultimate of fulfillment. And so, in this system we cannot see beyond ourselves, or beyond the race or nation. We become bound by the shackles of selfishness. Our hearts are caged, our wings clipped, and we must try to satisfy the deep urge of our nature by clicking our heels in obedience to some puff of dust who represents a link in the chain which enslaves us. This is not freedom, thank God.

And then there is another type of freedom given consideration in our times. We might call it "classical." The core of this theory is expressed by Dr. Hutchins of the University of Chicago in the words:

To be free, a man must understand the tradition in which he lives. A great book is one which yields up through the liberal arts a clear and important understanding of our tradition . . . it follows that if we wish to educate our students for freedom, we must educate them in the liberal arts and in the great books.

I think Mr. Denton Geyer, in his article "Three Types of Education for Freedom," has put his finger on the weak point of this theory. He says:

. . . we ask how the good, by which the human mind is to be both enslaved and freed, is to be ascertained. We know the good and the valuable, say some of the classicists, by intuition; we know it, says Mr. Hutchins, by reading the great books. The fact that one of the greatest books on his list, the Bible, has been so variously understood by its readers as to produce dozens of religious sects, does not seem to trouble him.

The fault here lies in a reliance on the unaided power of man to sift out the secrets of God. Rather than grasp the hand reaching

down from above to lift us to the knowledge of divine things, this system would have us pile book on book in an attempt to increase our stature so that we might peek over the parapet of Heaven. Unaided, we might be able to glean some inspirational thought from the books, but the certainty and strength that will batter down the walls of death will not be there. We must hear the secret from the lips of God.

There is another type of freedom proposed by Mr. John Dewey. Now, if experimentalism, which is considered synonymous with his philosophy, is at the basis of his ideas of freedom, then I say the whole thing is a delusion. For, as I understand experimentalism, man is nothing more than a highly developed organism, differing from the lower animals in degree but not in kind. He possesses no spiritual origin or principle of life, is a product of evolving matter and has no fixed end. In fact, Mr. Dewey denies both the existence of God and of the moral law. This then, is not freedom but slavery, a slavery that ties man to the pillar of the universe, entombs him in the dark depths of the material, crushes his spirit, binds his wings, and mocks at his aspirations to widen his horizon and feed the hunger of his soul for Truth, and Beauty, and Goodness. Such liberty is a hallucination, a trap, a cruel joke on man. We have suffered enough from this Circe enchantment.

Real freedom is predicated on the words: "You shall know the truth." How is this knowledge to be had? Well, certainly someone must help. The student will need one wiser and older to help him. The young person's intellect and will, the highest powers of his rational nature, need enlightenment, discipline and guidance. This can be given only by right education, which is vivified by a right philosophy. Cardinal Newman, in his "Idea of a University," wrote:

A liberal education teaches one to see things as they are.

Mr. Edward Fitzpatrick puts this nicely in the words:

. . . this human being, being sensitive on many sides to the complex modern world, will have the capacity to view things *sub specie aeternitatis*.

Mr. Welton, in his work, "What Do We Mean by Education?" follows this thought in the words:

If the pursuit of any subject strengthens the higher spiritual elements in any person, that subject is a factor in his liberal education; if it fails to do so it is not liberal, whether it be utilitarian or not. . . .

If, then, a liberal education is to develop the student so that he will "see things as they are," will view them "*sub specie aeternitatis*," will be strengthened "in his higher spiritual elements," we can realize something of the high purpose of formal education. One thing is certain, education must get back to fundamentals, it must begin with God, treat of man's relation to God, order man's life in God. I heartily agree with Dr. Hutchins when he says that the basic function of the universities is candid and intrepid thinking about fundamental issues. And what is this but saying that the purpose of formal education is to fit the individual for social and vocational competence here on earth and assist him to attain his ultimate end? Carrying out this idea, Mr. Howard Mumford Jones writes:

. . . and until we demand of the college of arts that it shall offer, in the largest and best sense of the word, philosophy, we shall not cure our confusion as to the place of the humanities in education.

Now this must be a true philosophy for there is only one source of truth, God.

With Father Bernardt, we say that:

full, complete, true education faces the facts of supernatural religion. It is safe when it bases its philosophy upon an acceptance of Original Sin, a remembrance of sanctifying grace. It sees man as individual, as social, as a unit member of a unit family, as a unit citizen of a unit state, as a unit member of a unit Mystical Body of Christ.

Or, we can say with Father Fenn that any educational theory which claims that man is self-sufficient to attain his ultimate perfection, that human nature has within it the seeds of its own perfection which need but be "drawn out" by conducive environment and the proper educative process, is to the Christian educator sheer nonsense. Philosophy and theology give us that truth which makes us free. If there is to be freedom through education, then our education must be in that truth.

Not so long ago, a man speaking to me mentioned that when he was a sophomore in college he was agnostic, as most sophomores

are, he added. Now I know in my own little circle five young men who entered the university with a lively faith and before they were half finished their course had lost every vestige of that faith. And the tragic part of the entire affair is this—the young men, one after the other, told me that they were unhappy, discontented, that they knew their condition was not as they wanted it, but they could do nothing about it. And, as I looked at them, I remembered the lines:

When you have seen the light of that goal die out of the face of a man, when you have seen him surrender hope of choosing a path to somewhere, and of stepping along that path, when you have seen the death of hope, you have seen the death of a man and the birth of a slave.

This is not the story of every college, but certainly is the story of those colleges where God is excluded, where a materialistic philosophy is taught, where men are trained solely for world service. And it is not at all difficult for me to understand how this comes about in schools which do not give man a knowledge of the basic truths of his being. I am convinced that the college can give no real service to the student unless philosophy and theology are the keystone subjects of the curriculum. Then it is that the classic and professional subjects will be properly interpreted by these speculative sciences. How else can our young men be prepared for their responsibilities as free men and free women in a democratic society? If we are truly Christian, let us be consistent. Nothing has meaning, neither freedom nor education, without a true understanding of man in relation to God. All educators of worth in a Christian sense seem to see the need for a knowledge of fundamentals, for a seeing of things as they are, but something drastically practical has yet to be done. So, I tell you this,—put philosophy and theology in the course of studies. Let God teach all of us the truths that make us free. It may take courage to do this but it takes courage to be a Christian, a friend of Christ. How else can you really love your neighbor, how else can you really serve your God save by performing your duty in such a way that His eternal Plan will be worked out in those under your charge? Certainly, many of our colleges have tried every possible theory and have failed. Why not try this way, why not give it at least the same opportunity given to all those

fuzzy systems which have played such havoc with the spirit of men? Is it so terrible to let God enter into the universities, is it so hard to let Truth have its day, is it so difficult to let Christ teach from your professorial desk? I know the vast majority of you are God-fearing, that all of you are seriously concerned with the right performance of your high office, that you wish nothing more than that the youth under your care be moral, religious, free for happiness. Then free yourselves. Don't be hounded by these materialistic philosophies of education based upon materialistic philosophies of life. Drive them out and supplant them with a living thing. Bring basic, fundamental truth into the curriculum through philosophy and theology. Free yourself through a firm belief in the practical worth of the Truth of God. "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Make that Truth work in the schools; with the humility of a child of God, set things in order in your own house. Then you will see those under your care going out into the world with a sure step, you will notice the betterment of relations between men, you will sense a new spirit on the face of the earth, for these graduates will find a real contentment in life, patience in adversity, strength in weakness, a deep consciousness of the sacredness of the power of knowledge. In them will truly be fulfilled the words: "They that trust in Him, shall understand the truth; and they that are faithful in love shall rest in Him; for grace and peace is to His elect." Then, lifting up his eyes to God, man will give flight to his soul, and from the depths of his spirit will rejoice in the words:

O Lord, I am thy servant, and the son of thy handmaid.
Thou has broken my bonds.

God bless you all in the great work to which you have been called.

RELIGION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

RALPH W. SOCKMAN

CHRIST METHODIST CHURCH, NEW YORK

THE presence of ecclesiastical representatives on your program year after year attests your recognition that religion has a place in higher education. How to meet the religious needs of the students without impairing the freedom of study is the common problem of the churches and the colleges.

Confession is good for the soul—even of a clergyman. And speaking as a representative of the church, may I say that religion must be more educational if it is to ask education to be more religious. We must confess that the pulpit has often flogged the will rather than fed the mind. We have frequently blamed the universities for destroying the faith of our youth, when in reality we had sent them to you with very little faith to shake. It is hardly surprising that a young man should stop praying, when higher education awakens his mind to the immensities and processes of the physical universe, if the only prayer he has ever learned is, "Now I lay me down to sleep."

We of the pulpit have too often given the impression of handing down our doctrines of creed and our rules of conduct in dogmatic fashion. It is little wonder, therefore, that our youth sometimes lose respect for our intellectual acumen and integrity when they are introduced to the project method of the college-classroom with its impression of professors and students as open-minded fellow-seekers after truth. The conclusion drawn is that the pulpit is concerned in presenting data to prove its preconceived thesis while the professor seeks only to follow where the facts may point.

Furthermore, the popular mind has been impregnated with the idea that ecclesiastical bodies are almost hopelessly divided by their sectarian and denominational differences. Youth are naturally repelled by what appears to them as narrowness and provincialism. This repulsion is increased by their courses in the liberal arts, which studies, if true to their intent, tend to emancipate the mind from prejudice and parochialism. We of the churches can hardly expect to lead the young or their

thoughtful elders in this day when all are longing for a united world unless we manifest a deeper and wider spirit of unity.

Perhaps I have made sufficient admissions to show the proper spirit of humility. May I say to Bishop Mussio that I have always been impressed by the way Saint Francis of Assisi kept himself humble. According to tradition, whenever Saint Francis had been praised, he always called in a fellow monk to tell him his faults. Of course, I might add that if Saint Francis had been married, he could have had that service performed at home without effort.

Having admitted these weaknesses on the ecclesiastical side, may I ask if there are not some confessions which could be made from the college side?

University circles tend to identify religion with its institutional implementation rather than its spiritual motivation. They see the shell and miss the seed. Taking this external and superficial view they over-emphasize the sectarian divisiveness and overlook the central unities.

Colleges in their desire for freedom resist the indoctrination by religion and accept the indoctrination by secularism. By ignoring the religious element in the treatment of formative cultural factors, the impression is given that religion is an irrelevant elective, all right for those "who like that sort of thing." Sometimes this silent treatment of religion is replaced by a supercilious attitude on the part of professors, who make the student feel that only the intellectually unemancipated still go to church. Quite frequently these criticisms of church policies and beliefs are based on observations made by the professor in some little provincial parish of his boyhood. Those who are wise do not take too seriously the shadows cast on the church by those who have not darkened its doors for twenty-five years. Students, however, are not so discriminating.

University teachers do not always accord religious leaders the respect given to specialists in secular fields other than their own. A professor of psychology would not presume to pass judgment on the findings of the physics department: but religion is commonly regarded as a realm in which one man's opinion is as good as another's—if not a little bit better.

Well, enough of these confessions. When we get beyond this

desultory sniping, we find that there is no war between the American church and the American college. Both are on the side of decency and democracy. Both are fighting for freedom and fullness of life. Both are awake to the dangers which threaten our ideals and institutions from atheistic and autocratic ideologies. Both know that the best defence against communist and fascist propaganda is a better cultivation of the wholesome features of our religious faith.

Both religious and educational leaders, however, are aware that this cultivation of our historic faith is sadly deficient. C. S. Lewis has posed the issue in his new book, "Miracles."

"If we are content to go back and become humble plain men obeying a tradition, well. If we are ready to climb and struggle on until we become sages, better still. But the man who will neither obey wisdom in others nor adventure for her himself is fatal. A society where the simple many obey the few seers can live; a society where all were seers could live even more fully. But a society where the mass is still simple and the seers are no longer attended to can achieve only superficiality, baseness, ugliness, and in the end extinction. On or back we must go; to stay here is death."

A religiously illiterate people eventually become an irreverent people. And when reverence is lost, all virtue becomes unstable. The person who reveres nothing lacks high incentives. When we cease looking up to something higher than ourselves, we start going downward. When we take away all the "no trespass" signs from life's garden and hold no spots as sacred, then the landscape soon is transformed from beauty to barrenness. Goethe put it not too strongly:

"There is one thing no one brings with him into the world, and it is a thing on which everything else depends, that thing by means of which every man that is born into the world becomes truly manly. That thing is reverence."

Reverence is easier to recognize than to define. But may we not regard it as the profound feeling of awe stirred by something regarded as of supreme reality and value. Reverence can be inculcated without sectarian rivalry. Roman Catholic, Protestant and Jew recognize and cherish the truth of the Hebrew proverb, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," or as Moffatt

translates it, "Reverence for the Eternal is the first thing in knowledge." Without reverence knowledge never becomes wisdom.

Higher education seeks wisdom rather than mere knowledge. While uncritical reverence has often been the foe of free inquiry, enlightened reverence is the only atmosphere in which freedom is safe and true tolerance is possible.

As I understand it, theories of higher education are roughly classified into three groups, which for lack of better terminology may be called, the "liberal," the "classical," and the "progressive." Certainly the "liberal" theory with its concern for "value" must recognize the need of the reverent spirit in safeguarding the ends of all our striving. And surely the "classical" theory in its accent on "truth" and the purely intellectual disciplines emphasizes objectives which can be reached only through a reverent spirit. To quote President Hutchins: "The aim of education is wisdom and goodness . . . we must reconstruct education, directing it to virtue and intelligence . . . the great problem of our time is moral, intellectual and spiritual."

And even the "progressive" theory of education with its emphasis on "adjustment," by which is meant both adaptation to one's world and willingness to change it—even this theory in the most recent books of its exponents shows a profound, almost reverent allegiance to the democratic ideal.

Therefore, cannot the three groups of educators, liberals, classical and progressive, and the three groups of churchmen, Jewish, Roman Catholic and Protestant agree that "reverence for the eternal is the first thing in knowledge"? And from that premise may we proceed to consider how and where religion can serve America's program of higher education.

Education shows its progressive spirit by its repeated efforts to reappraise its achievements and redefine its goals. Recently there appeared the first report of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education. Since the findings of this commission have not yet been fully published and since we are met here in Senator Taft's city of Cincinnati, I thought it might be more politically tactful to go for guidance to a commission which antedates the Truman Administration.

About nine years ago the National Education Association ap-

pointed a commission on secondary schools to redefine the aims of education. This commission came forth with four goals so simply stated and yet so comprehensive that they seem to me a suitable framework for the consideration of religion's contribution to the American college for while given to secondary schools, they are equally applicable to higher education.

The first goal is *self-realization*. While students are struggling for a multiplicity of ends, many of which are undefined, the general drive might be described as the desire to be somebody, to do something and to get somewhere. If religion can be seen as contributing to such self-realization, it will receive attention.

Too many young people have the idea that religion is a strait-jacket put over on them by their elders to make them "be good." They must be helped to see that religious faith has developed findings which are like formulas of living tested in the laboratory of long experience and that instead of being limitations they are enlargements of life, just as the experiences of former scientists and the experiments of present students.

The word "good" has connotations of varying appeal. The youth who resents being told to "be good" is eager to find the "good life." Henderson in his volume "Vitalizing Liberal Education," asserts that "education for the good life" is the ethical aim of the college. But he says "that what the good life is must be determined experimentally." But do we not have to admit that the individual student's span of years is too short for him to determine experimentally for himself what is good for him, and if he sets out to try all the experiments he will probably make his life even shorter? A neighbor of mine in a New York apartment house came into possession of a cornet at Christmas time. He seems to be trying all the possibilities of expression resident within that cornet. I am hoping that he will soon learn that some of the experiments on that instrument have been tested in the past and found wanting and that wisdom will prompt him to procure a teacher who will save him futile trouble and safeguard his neighbor's peace of mind.

Similarly the teachings of religion must be seen as a time-saving aid to what "progressive" educators call "the good life," even if they are not temporarily interested in religion as a soul-saving essential for the good life hereafter.

Also, religion should be recognized as a frame of reference for the student's whole outlook and not as merely another campus "activity." At one of our leading woman's colleges a year or two ago I found that the religious organization was regarded as one of the seven or more activities for which a girl could go out. There seemed to be no conception of it as a formative factor in shaping one's philosophy of life. It is little short of tragic when our liberal arts colleges allow mental departmentalization and fragmentation to infect even the freshmen.

Have we not a right to expect a liberal arts education to provide youth with a realistic frame of reference adequate to give meaning and worth to human personality? Self-realization requires some ultimate value from which the individual's value is adduced. Polonius' counsel to young Laertes, good as it is, is not good enough: "To thine own self be true, and it must follow as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man." Suppose Polonius had given that advice to young Hamlet. Would the young Dane in his agonized state of mind have known which aspect of himself was the norm to which he should be true? A man needs to be true to himself; he also needs to be shown, and shown repeatedly, what his true self is. And this is a function of religion.

President Eliot of Harvard was wont to say that the strongest incentive he could use with wayward boys was to remind them of the sacrifices made for them by their parents. Religion lengthens that retrospect of sacrifice. This gives a new appreciation of one's own worth. We cannot hold ourselves cheaply. These bodies of ours are no mere bundles of senses to be indulged selfishly as if their treatment were our own business. They are to be handled with reverence. These minds of ours are no mere flashes of sensation in a brain which will soon burn out and be no more. They are candles of the Eternal Light which "lighteth every man coming into the world."

The recent Report of the Harvard Committee, "General Education for a Free Society," states: "The true task of education is so to reconcile the sense of pattern and direction deriving from heritage with the sense of experiment and innovations deriving from science that they may exist fruitfully together." Accepting the soundness of this statement, may we not infuse campus

life with a religious spirit which enriches the pattern of heritage without impairing the freedom of science? Can we not awaken the student to see that he can hardly call himself cultured unless he knows something of the faiths by which men have lived? Religion is a factor of culture which has produced the greatest masterpieces of painting, music and literature, and can a person be regarded as educated if he does not explore the sources of such inspiration? Let us appeal to what they miss rather than to what they mustn't.

Religious art and music provide channels of spiritual stimulation not blocked by doctrinal differences. These resources have been only very partially developed both in secondary and in higher education. Our industrialized world, scorned by war, has left youth hungry for beauty. And beauty is one attribute of godliness.

After James Russell Lowell heard Emerson deliver the Phi Beta Kappa address at Harvard in 1867, he wrote these words:

"Emerson's oration . . . began nowhere and ended everywhere and yet as always with that divine man, it left you feeling that something beautiful had passed that way—something more beautiful than anything else, like the rising and setting of the stars." One contribution of religion is such a total, indefinable effect, like that which Emerson's speech had on Lowell. It creates a climate which stimulates the whole being; it disturbs us with the joy of elevated thoughts; it lures us toward a beauty beyond the ranges of routine living and toward values beyond the market-place; it humbles one's egoism and heightens one's self-respect; it gives us standing in the universe.

Having considered religion as an aid to self-realization let us turn to the second aim of education as listed by the NEA Commission. This is *training in human relations*.

In the recent report of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education appears this paragraph:

"Today's college graduate may have gained technical or progressive training in one field of work or another, but is only incidentally, if at all, made ready for performing his duties as a man, a parent, and a citizen. Too often he is 'educated' in that he has acquired competence in some particular occupation, yet falls short of that human wholeness and civic conscience which the co-operative activities of citizenship require."

Our emphasis on specialization has led Alfred Noyes to declare that we are "misled by small clever minds." We exalt the specialist and very often he knows his own field without seeing or caring how his specialty fits the general pattern. The liberal arts college must help the student to see life steadily and to see it whole.

Harmony in human relationship is not guaranteed by merely "getting together." The closer we get together physically the more conscious we become of our differences, as witness the sharpness of racial, cultural, religious and economic tensions in the crowded cities.

Training in human relations calls for more information about those of different racial and religious background. How much the present tension between Roman Catholics and Protestants could be lessened if each group had more authentic information about the other. As it is, most of the reported facts which a Roman Catholic reads about Protestantism or a Protestant reads about Roman Catholicism come from writers affiliated with the reader's own group. Or worse yet, the reputed information comes from spurious or anonymous sources.

But information about religious values and factors should and can have much wider scope. Secular college courses make the student aware of the part played by spiritual forces. My graduate study was done in Columbia under such men as Shotwell, Robinson, Beard and Dunning. References to religion were woven into the studies of European and American culture. How clearly we saw the impact of ecclesiastical polity on political theories. Courses in the social sciences, as well as in history, and literature, should give credit to the contribution made by religion.

Information can only make for happier human relations if it is inspired by the spirit of truth. The Master Teacher said: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." In the foggy atmosphere of our propaganda-beclouded day, we must clean the lens of our personal vision with the spirit of truth, so that we are willing to follow the facts as we find them. Only such truth-seekers can resist the pressure of the professional propagandists who make profit from playing on the fears and prejudices and hatreds of people.

And if the search for information is inspired by the spirit of truth, it reveals such a vastness of truth about God and Christ that no one group can claim to have a monopoly. When we have the modesty of seekers, we shall have a spirit of tolerance which is not condescension.

But training in human relations calls for imagination almost more than for information. Cold facts can make for "cold war." We must sensitize the imaginations of men so that they can see and feel how life is to those whose skin is of a different color, those whose racial backgrounds differ from their own, those who live in London or Moscow or Calcutta. This sensitizing of the imagination comes when we truly worship the God and Father of all mankind. Such worship is like looking up into a mirror in the ceiling and thereby being enabled to look down into other persons' places.

Our task now is to rise above the discussion of racial and class problems into the experience of fellowship, to translate our world outlooks into world brotherhood. And toward this, true religion is of immeasurable help through both information and imagination.

The third aim of education as given by the NEA Commission is *economic efficiency*.

Work is essential to vital living. Without work, human energies turn in on themselves destructively. Work gives a man courage. It is an anodyne to grief. It links a person with his comrades. And higher education in America deserves credit for doing a superb job in vocational training. However, does not economic efficiency call for more than vocational training?

We must give something to live *for* as well as something to live *on*. What sustains a person in worthwhile activities after his retirement from his vocation? Medical science has lengthened the normal period of human activity, while organized industry has shortened the period of employability. What an economic waste is found in those post-employable years if the individual does not have resources and interests to give him zest! Religion broadly conceived should help to supply these.

Then, too, economic efficiency calls for growth without displacement. The other day I engaged a taxi-driver in conversation. I asked him whom his friends favored for president,

After naming his favorite, he ventured a view about the presidential office which had a touch of originality. He said: "That's a job I wouldn't want. It don't offer no chance for advancement." No doubt it was a joke, but it carries a point. No job, however high, is satisfying if it offers no chance for advancement.

But what do we mean by advancement? Promotion from place to place, each with a larger salary and wider powers? Such a conception of progress makes for tenser competition and often leaves a trail of bitter disappointment. Furthermore, our colleges are no longer training a few select youth to be leaders. We have democratized higher education for the many. Obviously they cannot all become commissioned officers. Some must be great in the rear ranks.

We must teach youth that true advancement consists in growth rather than in change. We must Christianize the popular pattern of success at this point.

Religion regards man as a creature of God; science regards man as a creator. Perhaps this is one basic reason that religion has come to seem irrelevant in education, dominated as it is by the scientific spirit. We have so focused our study on what man can do through scientific processes that we disregard what is done for him. But man's highest creativity comes only when he also recognizes his creaturehood. Man's own productive capacities are expanded when he feels One "who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think according to the power that worketh in us."

Perhaps the nearest human analogy to this divine experience which I can suggest is an occasion when Toscanini was applauded by his orchestra after an unusually inspired rehearsal. Modestly silencing them he said: "Remember, gentlemen, it's not myself. It's Beethoven."

We are most economically efficient when our creative work is inspired, enlarged and sustained by a sense of the Creator within us.

The fourth task of education, according to the Commission whose findings we have been following, is training in *civic responsibility*.

We are here as representatives of American churches and American colleges. As such we are responsible to America, the

land by whose laws we are protected, by whose bounties we are supported, the land that we love. Yet as churches, true to the Hebrew-Christian tradition, we are responsible to God for America. We worship One who is sovereign ruler of the universe. And you as college educators share the same responsibility if you are loyal to the principles of our founding fathers. Basic to the whole political philosophy of those who established our Constitution and our institutions was the doctrine of divine sovereignty.

This fact is shown by the practice of requiring our president to take his oath or affirmation on the Bible, by the opening of our legislatures with prayer, and in various other ways. As Lincoln put it, America is "this nation under God."

In fulfilling our joint responsibility to "this nation under God," colleges and churches must train citizens adequately for a free nation. As Lord Moulton pointed out some years ago, unless we have sufficient citizens who will "obey the unenforceable," we must expect increasing regimentation until our free societies go the way of dictatorships. We need those inner sanctions which will restrain men when there are no laws or police to hold him back. We need to inculcate those ideas of right which rest not on expediency or the latest Gallup polls but on what mediaeval jurists and theologians called "the law of nature," which is the law of God. We need to remind the public that our much vaunted rights rest on the religious doctrines of man's divine sonship, regardless of race, creed or color. We need to clarify our concept of freedom so that any minority group which calls for tolerance will grant the same, in case it should come to power.

We are opposed to the totalitarian state which treats citizens as cannon fodder. We should also be opposed to any conception of the democratic state which treats the government as a pork barrel.

We must train citizens for a free world as well as a free state. Granted that America looks today like a garden spot in the wilderness of the world. How do you keep a garden when weeds are in the air from the surrounding wildness? You cannot fence against weeds. You cannot keep them out by taking youth out of school, putting uniforms on them and marching them up and

down the road. No, the only way to keep a garden is to cultivate it.

Our task is to cultivate our principles of freedom so that they apply to minorities as well as to majorities; to develop free enterprise so that it is as free for the one-talent man as for the ten-talent man; to revere human personality under whatever color so that life is worth so much more along the Ohio and the Mississippi that the race-conscious Orient will look to us as the apostle of liberty. Our task, in short, is to discern the difference between bigness and greatness and to make America so truly great that the world will come to love her for what she does rather than to fear her for what she might do.

Let us so serve "this nation under God," that we shall be serving the whole world.

THE INTEGRATED PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

HAROLD W. DODDS

PRESIDENT, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

ANY serious attention to the possibility of another war is a grim business. Because my subject does involve grim considerations, there is danger that what I am about to say will be understood as moral defeatism, if not perhaps moral cynicism. May I, therefore affirm at the outset that I do not believe that a world war is just around the corner. While disappointed, as you are, by the lack of progress of the United Nations to date, I do not despair because it has not accomplished more. I have long felt that any supra-national organization would have to begin modestly and earn its way to greater things on the basis of its success as it went along. But like most other people, I had not anticipated the degree of obstruction that the United Nations would encounter as soon as it began to operate. I think most of us anticipated—at least hoped for—less stormy weather for its launching and first voyage. While those fond expectations did not materialize, the fact remains that our only hope for avoiding another war rests with the United Nations, and America is the only hope for the United Nations.

I favor military preparedness for the United States far beyond anything we have yet known in peacetime because I feel that it is needed to make the United Nations work. It is more than a question of our own national security, however vital our security be.

As educators, we all approach the subject of *compulsory* military service with deep-seated repugnance. It is at variance with our whole philosophy of education and out of harmony with the ends that education seeks to achieve. On a money basis alone, it calls for funds sadly needed to improve the education, health and welfare of our youth. Obviously it can be justified only on the grounds of great necessity.

Perhaps you will bear with me while I say a word about my own position, since I have been accused of reversing my field when I signed the report of the President's Advisory Commis-

sion. To reverse one's field may be praiseworthy in football, but in other activities it is not so commendable and I should like to clear myself of evil implications of the charge.

When universal training was proposed during the war I privately and publicly opposed adoption at that time. The emotions of war afforded no climate for a reasoned decision on such a fundamental issue. It seemed clear that to adopt it then would adversely affect the chances for a just and wise peace. Although a cool view then of what the postwar world would be like gave little promise, despite the grand phrases in the Atlantic Charter, that power politics would be wiped out with the peace, or that America could escape being involved in them, it was the part of wisdom to wait and see before deciding what our peace-time policy on military preparedness should be.

I expressly repudiated then, as I do now, the so-called collateral benefits of compulsory military training. It can never compensate for the shortcomings of the home, the church and the school, as some think it would. Whatever contributions it might make to good citizenship are on balance highly debatable and slight, at best, for the simple reason that military discipline and citizenship discipline for civic responsibilities are two entirely different categories of human behavior. It would make no perceptible contribution to education and its benefits to the national health would be so slight, for reasons which I shall not elaborate now, as to offer no reason for its adoption.

However, I repeat, during the war I was not able to share the optimism of some who expected a new world order to arise immediately from the ashes of devastation and sorrow. I believed that, during the period required for any supranational government to develop, the United States would be faced with no alternative but to be strong militarily. It is more evident today than it was during active hostilities that if we are to be reasonably secure in the predictable future, and if our influence is to count for international collaboration and the reign of law among states, we must be able and willing to fight. As a nation we face, for an indefinite period, the duty of a difficult psychological balance between a readiness, on the one hand, to maintain that degree of force required to make us a strong voice in international relations, and on the

other, a zeal to promote with superlative patience the establishment of an international organization to administer the reign of law to replace that selfsame force. This sets a difficult task for any nation, (it is harder than riding two horses at once) but America can choose no other. If we plump for force alone we are doomed; but if we ignore force we are equally doomed.

It was wholly unrealistic and contrary to historical knowledge regarding the evolution and nature of government to expect the immediate upsurging of a democratic world state. Was it to be expected that Russia and the nations of eastern Europe, unacquainted as they are with the democratic processes of free elections, politically responsible executives, and the judicial settlement of private disputes, would immediately entrust their security to an agency like the United Nations so foreign to their experience? Was it rather not to be anticipated that they would feel that their security and national aims could better be attained through the traditional use of force than through an agency so new and novel to them—one that they were unable to understand, and whose underlying philosophy prevailing communism held in such contempt? Moreover, to the historic habit of power politics has been added the messianic drive of communism, which repudiates those ethical principles governing both means and ends which are the corner-stone of western civilization. There is no question in my mind that America must engage for a time in power politics. In my opinion, the real issue turns on how we use our power, not on whether or not we should exert power.

World conditions that could only be hinted at in our Commission's report last spring are now clear for all to read. Russia has demonstrated that she will not make use of the United Nations so long as she can attain her goals by old-fashioned methods. In the meantime, it is her policy to do what she can to bring the United Nations into contempt. The time has come to consider Russia on her record and not on the basis of what we hoped for her. As Professor Brogan has written, an "objective look at Soviet Russia" calls "for intellectual heroism and what is more difficult, emotional

heroism" on the part of all thoughtful persons who expected better things from her, and particularly from those who had heavy emotional investments in her. On the basis of information available to our Commission, and later developments, since now known to everyone, I can only agree with the statement of the celebrated Mr. X, with which his chief critic, Mr. Lippmann concurs, "that Soviet power will expand unless it is prevented from expanding because it is confronted with power, primarily American power, that it must respect."

This does not imply by any means, I repeat, that war is imminent, or even inevitable. It does imply that appeasement unsupported by power and clear evidence that we are willing if need be to use that power, is hopeless. In saying this, I do not want to give any aid or comfort, expressed or implied, to those of the old school who talk about absolute security through large armies and navies. There can be no such thing, so long as nations acknowledge no sovereign authority beyond their own. But what armaments can do is to make possible a firm and courageous American policy as the most promising assurance of that indispensable period of peace in which the United Nations may develop into a functioning world organization.

I certainly do not mean to imply that we should follow the logic of war, rather than the logic of peace. On the contrary, I fully agree with Professor Perry that we must exercise patience and forbearance. "We should," as he counsels, "exhibit generosity and high-mindedness . . . to raise the dispute (with Russia) to a level consistent with the gravity of the issue at stake." This is good sense, for the issue at stake is survival, but the question is not only one of good manners and forbearance on our side alone. As a matter of fact, I submit that our government, in the person of Secretary Marshall and his associates, is displaying unprecedented forbearance in the face of vilification, brazen falsification, repeated personal insults day after day across the conference table, and cold repudiation of those basic ideas of fair play which underly all peaceful human relationships. Personally, when I think of the nervous exhaustion attendant upon long drawn-out negotiations conducted in such an atmosphere, I

become diffident regarding preachments about patience directed to our responsible representatives, and pray that nerves worn raw will not crack, nor the point of human endurance be exceeded.

The foregoing has been a long introduction to a discussion of universal military training. My only reason for inflicting it on you has been that without some such background any proposal for a radical departure from America's traditional pattern of military preparedness is meaningless.

Of course, what I have been saying does not establish the case for universal training as a part of a program of national security in a world in which the atomic bomb will, sooner or later, be available to all great powers. What, therefore should be the pattern of our strength? To answer this question, one must ask what the character of another war, if it occurs, will be, and what will be required to protect ourselves and defeat the enemy. On this point there has been a great deal of rash talk, some on the part of scientists who have proved on occasion that they can be as emotional and unscientific as the humanists and social scientists are said to be in their weaker moments.

It is unfortunate that the mistaken idea that the next war is bound to be a push-button war has been implanted in so many minds. According to responsible scientific witnesses who appeared before our Commission, weapons in being or now foreseeable do not establish that either the United States, or any foreign power that might be pitted against us, will be brought to its knees by push-button warfare. True, atomic and other weapons, either self-propelled or delivered by airplanes, will be unspeakably devastating, but our Commission found that, with one possible exception, no scientist, who was abreast of the highly secret developments in this field, would say that any war within the foreseeable future would end in the initial super-blitz phase.

We may safely assume that the next world war will begin suddenly and without formal warning. We can assume that the United States will feel the full brunt of it at the start, and that there will be no wall of other nations to defend us while we are getting ready. We can also assume that the initial

attack will be through the air and that our defense against it will be feeble, for there will be little or no opportunity at this stage for intercepting combat planes to get into action.

No one can foretell the scope and scale of disaster which this first "super-blitz" attack would accomplish. Naturally we would retaliate with all the power we have, although the element of surprise would not be available to us. (For one thing, the United States cannot begin war without declaration by Congress.) We can assume, however, that we could begin to launch our own counter-offensive as soon as the first blow was struck.

It might be that this first, or super-blitz, phase of the war would determine the outcome. Personally, I do not believe that it would. It is probable (how probable no one can say) that if a future war comes to the United States, it will proceed through the familiar successive stage, from surprise attack to final invasion and occupation of the territory of the defeated nation. (The superficial effect of two atomic bombs dropped at the end of the war with Japan proves nothing as to what would happen another time. Her ability and will to fight had been virtually destroyed before the two bombs were released.) Somehow, in some way, proud nations will struggle on through later phases of hostilities despite the horror and destruction of the first. Surely we must assume when we contemplate an integrated plan for national security that the final outcome will not be determined by superiority in weapons of mass destruction alone. The United States cannot face the possibility of future warfare without large reserves of men trained and disciplined in the use of weapons and the techniques of warfare.

The report of the Advisory Commission has been criticized by both friends and foes of universal training for the fact that it put it in sixth place in the catalog of essentials of an integrated security program. To the ardent partisans of universal military training this spelled timidity and confusion on the part of the Commission. To the foes of universal training it signified a guilty conscience in a Commission appointed to do a job for President Truman. To the Commission, after six months of hard work, it seemed simple common sense.

The other five elements of an integrated security program we found to be:

1. *A strong, harmonious, healthy, educated and prosperous population.* This our Commission conceived to be our Number One security requirement. Various elements of this fundamental requirement for security were discussed in our meetings. For obvious reasons we did not undertake to duplicate the many comprehensive studies of a long list of agencies and commissions, official and unofficial, appointed to consider national problems of health, education, and political economy, and far more expert concerning them than we were.

2. *A co-ordinated intelligence service.* This does not refer merely to cloak and dagger stuff. Intelligence implies far more than espionage. I am informed that during the war the intelligence in respect to nations behind iron curtains furnished by trained scholars far exceeded in importance that reported by secret agents. The more we know about the rest of the world the better prepared we shall be to foresee threats to our safety or to the peace of the world.

3. *Scientific research and development.* I take it few will dispute the importance of this item in a program of national security.

4. *Industrial mobilization and stock piling.* Scientific discovery will, of course, be worthless unless it is matched by industrial readiness. If war should break out, time here will be just as crucial an element as in the case of the armed forces. Even a minimum program of security in the industrial field carries implications of wide significance to our historic system of free enterprise and low-cost industrial productivity. Some shallow partisans of preparedness should be taught that adequate preparedness entails more than the universal training of young men; it means the drafting of property as well.

5. *The regular armed forces of high professional competence, to consist of two categories:*

(a) A first line of offensive composed of a mobile striking force of highly trained troops, chiefly air power, to check the enemy's initial super-blitz attack so far as possible, and to hit back at once with all possible force. Defense by attack would be their purpose.

(b) A second line of offensive consisting of professional Army, Navy, Marine and Air Forces whose task would be

an immediate campaign for strategic bases anywhere in the world according to the location and nature of the enemy. The likelihood of heavy fighting and heavy casualties would have to be taken into account in the first struggles for bases.

6. *Finally, universal training* as the sixth element in our integrated program of military security.

I recognize that many thoughtful persons who concur in the argument thus far, part company with our report at this stage. Yet after weeks of earnest thought, our Advisory Commission concluded that there was no way, except through universal training, to guarantee a sufficiently speedy flow (and I emphasize speedy) of trained men to win a war, if large-scale fighting for bases or for invasion of the enemy homeland became necessary. And who can say that if war should break out such post-blitz fighting will not be necessary? Army officers are accustomed to stress the point that throughout history new weapons of warfare have consistently involved increasing proportions of the population. Whether this reasoning applies to the atomic bomb only the event can establish beyond dispute. However, I can not escape wondering in this connection what the effect would have been on the popular concept of future wars had the destructive forces of World War I been suddenly unleashed during, say the Spanish-American war of 1898. Would not the first impression have been then, as it is today, that large numbers of troops would not be employed in the next war because there would be no need for them or chance to use them?

The need for military manpower in another war would not be confined to conventional combat and supply troops. The moment the first bombs fell, a home defense force composed of persons trained in military discipline would be required, as an organized home defense, to attend the dead and wounded, to repair and restore essential community services, to control disorder and panic, and to prevent sabotage by fifth columnists. Our failure in the last two wars to organize a respectable home defense, whose shortcomings would have been clearly exposed had a squadron of German bombers reached one of our cities, should not close our eyes to the magnitude of the problem which would be upon us the moment an atomic war broke out. Any

peace-time civic disaster illustrates the complete inadequacy of untrained and unorganized civilians to deal with the problems that would attend any hostile attack with modern weapons.

The Commission's report made clear that universal training has no significance except as an element in a balanced program of security. "If the introduction of universal training" said the report, "should have . . . an indirect effect of weakening, rather than strengthening, the other elements of our national security, then our Commission is of the firm opinion that the adoption of universal training would be a mistake and would diminish rather than increase, our . . . security."

The program that we recommended extended to all male youth, physically and mentally capable of any form of service to their country in time of war, irrespective of whether or not such service is of a direct military character. Universal training would begin at age eighteen or on graduation from high school if that fell later than eighteen. The period of training would consist of two parts. The first part calls for a basic six-months of military training at camp or on shipboard, which would be required of everyone. During this six months the young man would pass through the basic training of a soldier on to unit training and some branch specialty training.

The second part of a young man's military obligation would be met by one of the following options. Upon completing the half-year at camp or on shipboard he could:

- (1) Elect to continue his basic training six months longer;
- (2) Enlist in one of the regular branches of our Armed Forces;
- (3) Enter one of the regular service academies, such as West Point or Annapolis;
- (4) Enlist in the National Guard for a fixed term;
- (5) Enlist in the Organized Reserve for a term;
- (6) Enroll in an ROTC course in college;
- (7) Enlist in the Enlisted Reserve Corps and enrol in a trade school or vocational school for training which would be of value in time of war;
- (8) Finally, for those for whom, for one reason or another, none of the above options would be open, enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, subject only to call for perhaps as much as one month of active training per year.

Our report proposed that the terms of basic training run from May 1 to October 31, and from November 1 to April 30.

High school graduates intending to go to college or directly into a vocation would, in general, be called for the May to October term. Thus the formal education of those going on to college would not be interrupted, although the last year of high school would be abbreviated about a month and freshman year in college shortened by a month to six weeks. For reasons that I shall not elaborate here, this adaptation seems to me to fall short of a major disaster.

Those trainees selecting the November to April period would come largely from the farms or boys already at work, for many of whom the winter would be the better season of the two. From the standpoint of cost and optimum use of facilities, our Commission recognized certain potential disadvantages in this method of scheduling. It would also set some limits on a complete intermingling of boys from all walks of life, but the mingling would still be greater than exists today between various social groups or geographical areas. The grouping of prospective college students in the May to October period might be interpreted as special favor, but with the rapidly growing numbers going to college and the expanding opportunities for those who want a college education this concession could not be rightfully considered undemocratic. Probably, as it would work out in practice, it would not constitute a measurable concession, since the winter period would be more convenient to many anyway. Developments on this score should, however, be carefully watched and studied. As the proportion of boys going on to college grows, a certain unbalance might develop between the numbers of trainees in the respective periods. It is my opinion that the nation should bear the cost of this imbalance rather than work a year's interruption to a lad's progress from school to college.

There is considerable opinion on the part of both the friends and foes of universal training that six months at camp is too short to be worth anything. My own opinion is that it represents the optimum period, and training at camp on a universal basis would pay rapidly diminishing returns, both social and military. The adverse effects on higher education alone would constitute a social loss that would not be recovered in increased military advantages. We believe that the term and

schedule we proposed will mesh with a boy's educational program without hardship to him or the college.

The fact that the basic military training must be of a serious type, not just advanced boy-scouting, realistically adapted to possible service in war, does not preclude a collateral information and education program. I admit, however, that it will have to be better than many so-called educational programs during the war to be successful. There would be opportunity for a comprehensive program of vocational guidance and our Commission recommended that it be made a mandatory portion of the program.

What can the six months of basic training accomplish? The chief military benefits would be as follows:

1. It would initiate our young men into the substantial psychological adjustments required of a soldier's life under conditions uncomplicated by war strains. (This point I consider very important.) It would develop habit responses (which is military discipline) to situations that will win battles and save lives if war should come, habit responses and adjustments that can be gained only as one lives the life of a soldier in a military environment.

2. It would make a young man familiar with the basic essential techniques of soldiering and advance him in unit and branch training to a point at which the National Guard and the Organized Reserve could build a more competent soldier than they have ever been able to do in the past. He would gain a knowledge of weapons and practice in integrated group movement and action which would afford an adequate preparation for further specialization and would substantially shorten the time in which he could be ready for action should war break out. (Of course there are some serious political problems still to be worked out in respect to these two components.)

3. It would enable the classification of our young men into the various branches of the armed forces and industry, and the channelling of them into fields and branches important to national defense.

4. It would afford the only practicable means for bringing the National Guard and Organized Reserve to the size and efficiency which our security requires. One of the difficulties

that the National Guard has had to face in the past is that, even after repeated enlistments, it could not hope to bring a citizen-soldier so far along as six months of universal training would accomplish. In general, I repeat, the whole program would shorten, certainly by six months, the period required to get citizen components ready for combat and to supply those who are to be under combat should war come.

The direction of universal training, we believe, should be under a commission of three, composed of two civilians (one to be chairman) and one military representative. The Commission would report directly to the President, not to the Department of Defense. While the daily operation must be the responsibility of the military (it must be rigorous military training—not pseudo or prettified military training) we think that it should be under civilian supervision. The trainees would be citizen-soldiers; they would not be under the Articles of War; they would not be subject to any military service at home and abroad. They would, however, be living as complete a life as soldiers and sailors, as would be consonant with their youth and inexperience. Safeguards could be thrown around them while in training that have never been possible in the general demoralization of wartime.

The success of the program I have outlined depends in the last analysis on the quality of the personnel which the Armed Forces would select to administer it. Some of the most serious doubts center around the matter of the type of officers which would be made available, the attitudes they would assume toward the young trainee and their ability to cope with his psychology and needs. Our report suggests various safeguards and incentives that will give prestige to this form of service, as well as certain sources that can be tapped for officers and non-coms of the right sort. One thing is certain, if training personnel of any but the highest quality is selected; if any sort of adverse officer-selection obtains such as has been reported as prevailing before the war in the case of the ROTC at some universities; if the Armed Forces do not understand that they are confronted with a new challenging situation, foreign to their experience in the past, universal military training will fail and the American people will abolish it with decisive

promptness. The successful conduct of a universal military program will be a more severe test for the Armed Forces than for the young trainees.

The more one contemplates the truly totalitarian nature of another war and the cruel destruction and suffering it would bring, the more does one realize that the United Nations must be made to work. I can find no grain of hope in uni-lateral disarmament or weak appeasement in the world as it exists today. I believe for our own safety as a democracy, and for the sake of what we know as western civilization, we need to adopt the integrated preparedness program of which I have been talking. Although our colleges and universities have been one of the chief centers of opposition to any proposal for universal military training, of one thing I am certain, if America decides that it is in the public interest, they will loyally lend themselves to it.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

ALEXANDER GUERRY

PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH

SINCE the background out of which a man speaks, especially on a topic like Universal Military Training, is of some concern to an audience, I wish to make a brief personal statement. Mine is a military family running in direct line from General William Moultrie of the War of the American Revolution through my two sons who fought in the last great war, one a pilot with the 5th Air Force in the Southwest Pacific, the other a rifle platoon leader of the 84th Division, both decorated for valor in battle, both reserve officers now. I served overseas with the 320th Machine Gun Battalion of the 82nd Division in World War I. For the past twenty-five years I have been civilian aide to the Secretary of War for the State of Tennessee because I believe in preparedness and national defense and because I believe that, as terrible as war is, the enslavement or the helplessness of a nation is worse.

Four reasons lead me to oppose Universal Military Training, the plan of the President's Commission or plans of the War Department.

I. Universal Military Training will be ineffective and inadequate for national defense. It will not serve the purpose it is intended to serve, the statements of army and naval officers and other supporters to the contrary notwithstanding. Second, Universal Military Training in peacetime and over a number of years will change inevitably the character of our people and the character of our nation. Third, it is folly right at this time in the history of the world and in the history of warfare to adopt a policy of military preparedness which is such a drastic change from our whole procedure and thinking when other means of national defense would be sufficient. Fourth, the arguments for Universal Military Training with regard to discipline and citizenship are so wrong and misleading that they are proof in part of our impending misfortune if this nation adopts a program of compulsory military service.

World affairs are in a critical situation. The threat of another war is very real. We may be called upon to defend ourselves by arms or to defend others helpless except for our strength. We realize that the United Nations cannot yet curb aggression. We have commitments as a victor nation to police conquered countries and to assist them in the slow and painful process of reconstruction. We must have a firm, clear foreign policy and the power to back up our foreign policy, the sort of program which Secretary Marshall has so boldly proclaimed.

Because of all this we must have an adequate regular Army, Navy, and Air Force. No one can gainsay this.

Furthermore, if war comes again, the first blow will be aimed at us. As military officer after military officer has said, in a next war we shall not have time to get ready. The enemy will strike with incredible swiftness and will seek to win right at the first. The outcome will be determined largely at the beginning by the effectiveness of the attack, by the effectiveness of the instant defense, or by the effectiveness of the immediate counter-attack.

This means an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force, thoroughly trained, completely equipped, and *ready to fight*. There is no substitute for such an Army, Navy, and Air Force at this time. When Army officers and others speak of the swiftness of attack in the next war, the terribly destructive power of weapons and bombs, the complexity of modern instruments of warfare, and the necessity of preparedness, and at the same moment urge Universal Military Training of young boys to meet the situation at this hour or in the near future, they contradict themselves. They advocate a futile program. Neither the young men actually in training nor those having completed their training in previous years will be ready or will have the necessary skill and experience.

How are we to have an Army, Navy, and Air Force sufficient to meet our obligations abroad and to defend ourselves and our allies? The answer is by voluntary enlistments and, if voluntary enlistments are not enough, by a selective service act constantly available for operation. A selective service act can function as effectively and as fairly to produce a thousand or a hundred thousand men a year as it can to produce five hundred thousand or a million men, and can expand or contract according to need.

A selective service act will be necessary if the Army, Navy, and Air Force are to have a sufficient number of men for their needs and if voluntary enlistments do not produce the required personnel, even with a program of Universal Military Training.

Under the provisions of the proposed Military Training Program, the young men in military training shall not be sent abroad, shall not be called upon to bear arms, shall not actually be considered in the Armed Forces. It is not a choice between Universal Military Training for young boys and a selective service act. We will have the latter sooner or later, if it is required for the necessary number, whether or not we have Universal Military Training.

The Army and Navy can do much that has not been done to encourage voluntary enlistments and to attract young men to the military as a career. This is an important point and I wish there were time to elaborate upon this matter. Armed Forces of sufficient personnel can be undoubtedly maintained, in my judgment, through voluntary enlistments and without the use of a selective service act, provided the military makes such an accomplishment the special objective of their best efforts and most careful planning.

In addition to an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force, our government should maintain the National Guard and the ROTC and should re-activate and expand the CMTC. There are great possibilities in the CMTC for the training of a large number of young men for three or four months each summer. And a very large number will be in attendance each summer if the trainees receive a modest monthly stipend to relieve them of the necessity, or to offset the advantage, of working during the vacation period. All this would mean a multitude of reserve officers and general reserves for whatever purpose they might serve in peace or in a war.

There should be, of course, an extensive program of research, scientific investigation, and experimentation for the development of every means of defense and attack.

We should do our utmost, of course, to convince the world of our deep desire for peace. At the same time, we should *make it clear* to Russia and to other nations that it is our *determination* to fight if need be. Certainly preparedness is a limited preven-

tive against war since an enemy would be reluctant, though not necessarily unwilling, to risk war with a strong United States. But the better way by which to impress Russia and to achieve the advantage of preparedness is not Universal Military Training but a definite foreign policy that tells all peoples where we stand, and an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force, supported by auxiliary agencies and by scientific research and experimentation.

One of the dangers of Universal Military Training is that for many it has become a panacea for our problems. Pass a Universal Military Training law and have peace and security—and also discipline, health, better citizenship, and finer education.

II. Universal Military Training in peacetime over a number of years will change inevitably the character of our people and the character of our nation. For the federal government to take charge of all young men in this country for a year as a regular practice year after year will make this a different country and will make us a different people. Conscription in war—certainly. Conscription in peace—absolutely no. Just as surely as we enter upon Universal Military Training, the federal government and the military will extend their control over our lives and gradually take away our freedom. Little by little they will destroy our initiative, our independence, our differences and diversities which are with unity the source of our strength and greatness, and lead us into more and more regimentation.

Peacetime military conscription is the most hazardous step a free state can take, especially one the size of the United States. And it ought to be a very last resort, an urgent military necessity anticipating and looking toward an immediate and inevitable war. For under peacetime Universal Military Training, over a period of time, slowly but surely, we will lose the very precious things we would go to war to save.

III. It is folly at this time in the history of warfare and the history of the world to adopt a policy of military preparedness which is such a drastic change from our previous thinking and our previous procedure. Here we are with the atom bomb and the instrument of bacteriological warfare. We cannot comprehend their devastating possibilities or the possibilities of other weapons of destruction now in process of development. We do not even know that wars in the future will be fought by armies. We do not even know how a next war will be fought.

We should use and strengthen therefore, to the degree necessary, the agencies we have, and which are sufficient to meet the situation, rather than change our way of life and the character of our nation by a new procedure which, as an old procedure for other nations, has gained them nothing. The great advantage of the former is that we can enlarge or decrease the size of our Armed Forces and the general scope of our defense program as the world situation changes, as it may well change in any year. This is infinitely better than to commit ourselves to a plan of Universal Military Training which once entered upon will surely run for a long time to come.

Here we are, after the most frightful war in history, seeking and praying for peace on earth as the alternative to war and the collapse of civilization. Here we are trying to make a success of a world federation, the one real and only ultimate hope for peace. How can we go ahead at this time with a drastically new procedure and adopt a program which amounts almost to an open declaration on our part of the inevitability of war?

IV. The arguments for Universal Military Training with regard to discipline and citizenship are not valid. If, however, the Congress passes a Universal Military Training bill, it will do so largely because the members of Congress and the people of our country have come to believe that a year of military training will promote discipline and patriotism among our young men. I say this because of my actual conversations with hundreds of men and women.

Self-discipline and self-restraint, the only kind of discipline of any value, have never yet been the result, with rare exceptions, of military training. Military training in Army and Navy has not produced discipline, as a rule, beyond the reach of military authority. That is one point.

But the main point in this matter is that in the advocacy of Universal Military Training because of the benefits and need of discipline, one can see the hand of the state reaching into the home. One can hear Dr. Gini, the Fascist professor from Rome, saying at Harvard's Tercentenary, "The discipline of the family, of the school, of the church has failed. The only source of discipline and order is the state. Hence, the justification of the authoritarian state."

If our young men need more discipline, and many do, let the home, the school from the elementary grades through the university, and the church be more alert to their responsibilities. They are the only source of discipline in the long run. If they are falling down on the job, demand that they do the job. Do not call on the government or the Army or Navy to accomplish what these agencies have failed to accomplish. If we do, then the home, the school, and the church will expect the government to assume this responsibility and they will push aside their own responsibilities. And in the end there will be less discipline than ever, and less character.

I am not concerned with the enrolment at my institution or at any other. No one need be in these days. But I am concerned that young men have the opportunity of freedom in college upon their graduation from high school. That is the great experience for the high school graduate, the experience of growth in responsibility and character through freedom; the experience of freedom as the avenue to discipline, responsibility, and character.

With all of their defects and imperfections, that is the proud accomplishment of the finer colleges and universities. This country would do ill to throw away one of the basic reasons for its greatness, thinking that it was getting for its young men the very qualities they might lose, the qualities they must have in any war between nations and in the war that always goes on in this world, the war between good and evil.

And this country would do ill to interrupt and prolong the educational process, thinking that it was providing through peacetime conscription not only a valuable lesson in discipline but also an opportunity for better preparation and more maturity for college, an erroneous idea, all too prevalent because of the fine record and attitude of the great majority of veterans who did continue rather than discontinue their education and who are products of war and not of peacetime military training.

One hears on all sides the statement that Universal Military Training is the obligation of the citizen, that it is the citizen's patriotic duty to give a year of his time to his country, that the man will be a better citizen as a result of a year of peacetime military training. It is a man's patriotic duty to give himself

every year to the welfare of his country. Citizenship is a never-ending responsibility. Every man and woman should serve their country to the best of their ability every year all the year. Military training and military service have not yet demonstrated that they prepare a man in a special or better way for unselfish continuing, patriotic service as a citizen of the state. Here again we are looking to the state to accomplish what the state cannot accomplish but what the state in the long run can destroy.

Finally, under the proposed plans of Universal Military Training, education and the whole educational process will be increasingly influenced and dominated by the government and by the Armed Forces, to the ultimate serious disadvantage of education, our young men, and our nation.

I urge this Association to go on record as opposed to compulsory Universal Military Training. I urge you to take this step notwithstanding the patriotic army and naval officers and many fine citizens who support earnestly the program of Universal Military Training; notwithstanding the ardent campaign of the government, the War Department, and veterans organizations for military training; and notwithstanding the pacifists, radicals, and communists, who are against Universal Military Training, the last of whom are conspicuously against our country and our way of life.

And I urge you to go on record as favoring:

- (1) A firm, clear foreign policy for the United States.
- (2) A willingness and determination on the part of America to play its part in world affairs and to accept the responsibility of world leadership that has come to us.
- (3) An adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force thoroughly trained and equipped.
- (4) Development of auxiliary agencies to support our Armed Forces, including peacetime Selective Service, providing that voluntary recruitment proves inadequate.
- (5) Development of technical and scientific research and experimentation for war as well as peace.

(6) Reduction in armaments of all nations as circumstances permit.

(7) A constant declaration of our desire to live at peace with other countries, and an everlasting effort on our part to help build and maintain an effective federation of nations for the purpose of putting an end to war and aggression and preserving peace, liberty, and justice for all peoples on this earth.

UNESCO

LAURENCE DUGGAN

PRESIDENT, INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

HOW it started, I don't know, because the driver spoke no English and the fare spoke no Spanish. Yet during the half-hour ride from downtown Mexico City to Coyacan, they carried on, animatedly, through gestures and word fragments. There was something that they had in common, that they shared together. Finally, the passenger got out and paid his fare. Quickly, the driver returned a shining silver peso—"Para UNESCO," he said, "viva UNESCO" and drove off.

Many conclusions can be drawn from this little story but for me it brings out that many little people have faith in UNESCO. They have only a hazy idea of what UNESCO is or does, but they believe that UNESCO was set up to work with them and for them.

This is all very fine. It reveals the inspiration, the promise that has fired the imagination of many persons. But it is also a caution: that people not be misled into expecting too much and too soon; and then, that UNESCO lay out a course and hew to it.

The first caution is particularly applicable in this country. Here UNESCO has caught hold at the grass roots. It has stirred hearts as has no other agency of the United Nations.

And these people are continually asking—what can I do to help UNESCO? The question is genuine enough but it is very important that they get the right answer in order to avoid a misconception which might bring disappointment. And disappointment frequently is followed by that despairing feeling of "what's the use" which in the field of international affairs leads straight to nationalism and isolationism.

UNESCO is going to carry on few projects, if any, where our people will see UNESCO conducting an operation in their home town. If John Jones, of Ohio, gets the idea that he is going to help UNESCO by working on some UNESCO-organized, UNESCO-conducted project in Ohio, he is mistaken. John Jones should be brought to see that he can only effectively help

UNESCO by participating in activities that advance the objectives of UNESCO in his own home town. There is plenty of work to be done here at home—right in the community where John Jones lives. We have no reason for smug satisfaction—for the vicarious complacency that everything is all right here but that the troubles of the world are elsewhere.

Now this is the first place where our colleges come in. They are natural vehicles through which UNESCO should work. They are engaged, in the words of the UNESCO preamble, in the "unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge." They are repositories of learning. They are centers of instruction. And more and more, they are recognizing a responsibility for assisting the communities where they are located to an understanding of international relations. So our colleges could help immensely by dispelling the notion, whether in the college or in the community, that UNESCO is going to carry on activities in every little hamlet.

This, of course, assumes that there is a consensus of what UNESCO's objectives are and how they should be realized. And this brings me to the second caution, that UNESCO lay out a course and hew to it.

UNESCO has not done that yet. UNESCO is somewhat like a rider who has jumped on his horse, given him a jab with spurs, and started off without knowing where to.

Perhaps this was inevitable. Perhaps the only way to get a consistent, meaningful program is through trial and error, by engaging in a variety of activities and then assessing the results to see which activities are productive. But it should be noted that even the selection of these activities implies certain standards, and it was precisely the absence of standards which made the first year's program adopted in Paris so diffuse. That program lacked focus. It was not aimed at any discernible target.

At Mexico City, a good deal was accomplished in the way of focus, and concentration but the program finally adopted was *still* spread over too much ground. It suffered from the same ill that plagued the Paris meeting, namely varying interpretations of what UNESCO is supposed to do.

For example. The war-devastated countries think that

UNESCO should primarily concern itself with the reconstruction of their educational facilities.

The underdeveloped countries think that UNESCO should primarily aid in providing a minimum of education to their illiterate masses, and I might add that there are some from underdeveloped countries who fear that if this is done through mass media, it will mean the crossword puzzle, the detective story, and the comics.

These are only a few of the different concepts of UNESCO but they are sufficient to illustrate the confusion of voices. In my judgment, if UNESCO is not to lose precious time, a few basic criteria must be hammered out which will serve as the backdrop against which individual proposals may be projected and considered.

I suggest that our colleges address themselves to this need. I propose that in some quiet spot there be brought together a half dozen of our leading educators, culturalists and scientists for a week of leisurely discussion. This group should be asked to prepare a policy statement about the purposes and methods of UNESCO and this statement should be the main item of discussion at a future meeting of the U. S. National Commission. This group discussion procedure might be repeated on many college campuses so that the National Commission would have more than one proposal to study. After going over all the statements and finally formulating its own, then the U. S. National Commission might sit down with the national commissions of other countries, and under similar conditions propitious for calm deliberation, to see how far our ideas were shared by others. A series of such conversations before the next conference at Beirut might clear the atmosphere and establish some generally acceptable criteria for considering projects and budgetary allocations. It is futile to think that this groundwork can take place at the conference itself. Delegations are too busy pushing their pet projects.

Turning now to the Mexico City Conference itself, several actions were taken of direct interest to our colleges.

I will not attempt to list all of these activities authorized under these six hearings of interest to the colleges since this would be too long, but I will mention a few activities or projects which seem to me to offer peculiar opportunity for cooperation.

First of all, the Director General was instructed to call together a meeting of representatives of universities. (There can be no doubt, I think, that representatives of the American college would be included in any such meeting.)

One of the purposes of this conference would be to establish an international association of universities. In this regard, may I remind you that at the conference held last June, under the auspices of the Association of American Colleges, a resolution was adopted reading, "That the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges consider the creation of an international organization of colleges and universities." So UNESCO is taking leadership along a line already approved by many college authorities in this country.

Another item to be considered at this conference is the equivalence of degrees. I suspect that there is not a college here that has not been bedeviled with the evaluation of degrees of foreign students, frequently with unhappy results both for the student and the college. At the Institute of International Education we are plagued every day by the insufficiency of reliable data. If UNESCO can get a project under way in this field it will be performing a needed service, especially useful in this country to which foreign students are coming in increasing numbers from remote countries.

Turning to another field, an assignment given the UNESCO Secretariat that has immense appeal for me is the study of the tensions which potentially lead to war. This study will be to survey scientifically tensions of all kinds—geographical, political, religious and technological.

Since the United States has made especial contributions in sociological studies of this character, it seems to me a splendid opportunity for many of our colleges to work with UNESCO in the execution of this project. As a matter of fact, the resolution itself stipulates that UNESCO shall enlist the resources and distribute the work among colleges and universities and that co-operating agencies may propose reformulation of projects in order to insure greater precision or to "enable them to investigate tensions with greater efficiency and by improved methods."

The atom bomb, of course, had its effect in the formulation of projects. Throughout the Mexico City Conference there was a

continuous and earnest discussion, not at the formal session but around the dinner table as to the role of science in UNESCO. The scientists had no difficulty in agreeing among themselves as to the scientific activities in which UNESCO should engage but their point of view was attacked by many educators. Within the United States Delegation there was a sharp cleavage of opinion. This disagreement should be cleared up before another UNESCO Conference. It should be thrashed out at the group discussions that I mentioned.

However, scientists and educators were in agreement at Mexico City on the need for consideration of the social implications of science. The Director General was requested by the Conference to stimulate discussions on this topic. Where is there a better forum for these discussions than our own liberal arts colleges? And what better way of cooperating with UNESCO?

Another activity of UNESCO of special interest to the colleges is the international exchange of persons. A Conference resolution charged UNESCO with collecting and publishing information on private and public activity on this subject. Specifically, it asked UNESCO to compile data on the "number, character, availability and sponsorship of fellowships, scholarships and other type of assistance . . . together with information on fellowship awards, field and countries of study." There has long been a dearth of such information. As a result, it is impossible today to say with any certainty how many and what kind of scholarships are being offered to the war-devastated nations. If the information were available, I suspect it would show that some countries are being offered many times the fellowships offered to other countries whose educational facilities were more severely damaged, and where the need is far greater.

This compilation of information the American Delegation considered extremely important. It believed that this was a unique contribution which an international intergovernmental organization could make and that it was indispensable in bringing about the creation of any large number of additional scholarships. It pointed out that last year there was awarded to students studying in other countries than their own possibly 15 or even 20 million dollars worth of scholarships, a sum three times UNESCO's budget, and that this amount undoubtedly could be increased,

were exact information available as to what is being done and what the remaining needs are.

This view was contested by the war-devastated countries which wanted UNESCO itself to provide as many scholarships as possible, even though these might not have totalled more than some thirty new ones for 1948. This point of view is understandable but reveals a lack of comprehension of the possibilities of creating hundreds, possibly thousands, of new scholarship opportunities particularly in this country.

There is one situation in the United States relating to scholarships and UNESCO which may prove troublesome. This arises from the solicitation from our colleges and universities of scholarships for UNESCO. The purpose is well intentioned but the results present complications. Many institutions have provided remission of tuition or even more, but in only a very few instances has sufficient financial aid been given to cover *travel* and *incidental expenses*. In general, UNESCO cannot use anything but such all-inclusive scholarships because it does not have the necessary supplementary free funds to build them up. Mr. William Carter, the Director of the Bureau of Exchange of Persons, has stated that UNESCO does not care to be offered partial scholarship opportunities, but only what he calls a "complete package."

In all of these matters, the college is in exactly the same position as John Jones, of Ohio. UNESCO will not go to the college any more than to John Jones. If the college sits back and waits for UNESCO to come along with some nice proposal for co-operation, it will probably wait until Doomsday. No, it is up to our colleges to take the initiative. This might include the submission of a project to UNESCO for cooperation in some field, such as the tensions study, but the initiative is more likely to be in ways already well known—revision of curriculum, the enlistment of student interest in their fellow students from abroad, provision of information on international relations in the community, the development of exchange of students and professors. These are functions which every college regardless of UNESCO ought to do anyhow. UNESCO provides a new incentive for action but it is not a substitute for action by educators nor can it ever be. UNESCO has a tiny budget—one-quarter that ap-

propriated this year for the University of Illinois. Even if its budget were doubled or quadrupled, it would still be insignificant compared to the need and other resources. The main responsibility for cultivating the art of human relationships must rest where it has always rested, with education. UNESCO can be a stimulus and symbol—and very powerful too. It moved a Mexican teacher on crutches, accompanied by his wife and eight children, to visit the Deputy Director General. "This Mexican family," he said, "offers itself in the cause of peace." And certainly no one who saw the pageant performed by thousands of school children at Mexico City will ever forget the concluding number. In an atmosphere of suspense, three huge volumes were brought in. One read "Education," another "Science" and the third "Culture." Then, at a bugle call, the covers were turned back and there stood revealed the three initials P A X.

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE AND UNESCO

FRANCIS S. HUTCHINS

PRESIDENT, BEREA COLLEGE

THE purpose of UNESCO and its progress to date have been reported by Dr. Duggan. It is decidedly appropriate that this discussion be placed upon the agenda of the Association. Each individual, each institution, has a direct, imperative interest in the maintenance of peace. And each of us believes that peace must be founded upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.

It is quite possible that the membership of this Association claim a part in any progress which has been made in times past, for by conscious direction much of our work has resulted in educational, scientific and cultural contacts with individuals and groups from other countries. We have known that there is no such thing as Chinese or Polish chemistry, and we have known that there is no such thing as Brazilian physics or English physics. We have known that science is international, and we have known that "culture is by nature universal."

We have made a contribution to the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind directly by our participation in the search for truth, and inasmuch as we have made contact with individuals of other countries, we have contributed to mutual understanding.

I believe that much of our best work has been somewhat incidental. For example, every American college and university has received students from foreign lands. They have lived and studied among us and they have aided us as we have aided them in understanding one another. It is my impression that we have been casual in our reception of foreign students, in our planning of the work which they might take, and much has been left to their own initiative in the learning of American ways of life and thought. Now the stake is very high and the responsibilities very heavy and important.

The stake is world peace. Better than almost any other group we understand that peace based only upon political and economic arrangements is not likely to be as secure as that based upon

"mutual understanding and a truer and more perfect knowledge of each other's lives."

None would deny that American colleges and universities have a responsibility far greater than in prewar years. Only the institutions of learning of the western hemisphere escaped the physical destruction of war. Thus the resources to meet present challenges are more available in our institutions than elsewhere.

(My own international contact has been in China where all but one or two institutions of learning suffered removal, capture, or destruction.)

The physical damage of war has crippled universities abroad, but even more serious has been the physical and mental starvation of students and teachers alike. The loss of laboratories, libraries, journals, contact between scholars, makes difficult the taking up of intellectual activity. From many letters from abroad we know that the cessation of hostilities has not meant that educational life could now go forward.

The situation overseas and our own relatively favored position are familiar to us all. The next step is urgently before us for planning and execution. How can American colleges and universities most effectively make their contribution to the achievement of the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind? Are the Mundt Bill, the Fulbright Bill, other acts of legislation, UNESCO, sufficient to achieve the desired results?

My own suggestion is that the colleges and universities of this Association and other organizations like it, are *essential* to the achievement of this moral and intellectual solidarity, if it is achieved. This is true, for our first interest is in the realm in which this may be most readily achieved.

Dr. Robert Redfield, speaking from Mexico City made this clear when he said: "What we seem to have is two worlds in relationships among people—the world of power, where competition is destructive, dangerous, and builds up tensions, and the world of education, culture and science, which is creative, productive. The problem is to make that second world independent of the former and to develop its resources and institutions on its own terms immediate to its own imperatives." The colleges and universities are agencies of this second world of education and culture.

I would suggest several propositions:

- I. That in gaining understanding between peoples, colleges and universities have a place of the utmost importance. Programs seeking mutual understanding and a truer and more perfect knowledge of each other's lives must not be left to government agencies alone.
- II. That by far the most effective method of gaining such mutual understanding is the interchange of persons, knowledge and skills, particularly persons.
- III. That the members of this Association should increase the number of foreign students received, and find places for visiting scholars on their faculties.
- IV. That we devise better ways of admitting and receiving students from other countries by:
 - a) gaining some understanding of the prospective student's abilities (his use of English) and his interests before he leaves his home country.
 - b) appointing on each campus a counsellor who will closely work with each student, not to coddle him, but to be sure he does not waste time and effort in becoming oriented.
 - c) that student government and student groups be encouraged to make sure that foreign students have contacts in American homes with normal home life. Effective efforts should be made constantly that foreign students become a part of the campus life of any college and that off-campus opportunities be developed so their understanding of American life may be whole.
- V. That in their campus programs and community contacts the colleges and universities lay stress upon the need for understanding between peoples, and give full publicity to their own programs, those of the government, and UNESCO.

PENDING LEGISLATION

BEN M. CHERRINGTON

SOCIAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

THERE is before the Congress a bill introduced by Congressman Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota (H.R. 3342), known as the "United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1947."

The Bill was passed by the House, but not acted upon by the Senate. Instead, a Committee of the House and Senate visited Europe this past summer to study the country's existing informational and cultural program with a view to determining the type of legislation required. A number of leaders in national organizations representing education, science, the fine arts and so on have been studying the Bill. We have arrived at certain conclusions for the consideration of this group of representatives of American colleges and universities.

Our first recommendation is that the Bill be amended in such a way as to provide for a complete organizational and administrative separation of informational activities from educational exchange and other international cultural activities in the Department of State. If this complete divorcement of the two functions cannot be accomplished by means of an amendment, then we recommend two bills—one authorizing international information activities by the Department of State and the other authorizing educational and scientific exchange and other forms of international cultural cooperation.

Briefly, the reasoning which has led to this recommendation that the two functions be completely divorced is as follows: Citizens of the United States would resent and resist any unilateral attempt by another government to impose its education or culture upon our people. Citizens of other lands similarly would resent any attempt on the part of the United States to impose our education or culture upon them. People everywhere are sensitive and resistant to anything resembling cultural imperialism. However, the people of America and likewise of many other countries welcome and cordially support educational and cultural exchange when it is reciprocal and carried on for mutual benefit. Educa-

tional, scientific and cultural exchanges so conceived and honestly carried out fortify freedom and democracy and contribute substantially to the basic objectives in American foreign policy. Our government already is party to a number of bilateral and multilateral exchange agreements based upon this principle of reciprocity, and through our membership in UNESCO, doubtless these will multiply with great rapidity. In other words, a sound program of educational, scientific and cultural exchanges should be conceived as a long-range undertaking arising out of international agreements which seek international collaboration for mutually agreed-upon objectives.

It is our judgment that information activities, while an extremely important and necessary function of the Department of State, are of a distinctly different character from educational, scientific and cultural exchange. Information is essentially an instrument of national public relations abroad and as conducted today seeks to implement the diplomatic policies of the Department of State. Much of it under present conditions must be conducted on a unilateral basis. In the current world situation, information activities are inextricably bound up with international power relations. Their purpose must be to explain American policy, to correct misunderstanding, to keep the record straight. But no matter how accurate and fair information may be, it always will be interpreted by citizens of other countries as the propaganda of the United States Government.

In our view, therefore, it is most unfortunate that information activities at present are combined with educational exchange and cultural activities in the same office, the Office of Public Affairs, in the Department of State. Until recently, an Assistant Secretary of State has had responsibility for both types of undertakings. This mixing of the two functions, in our judgment, is a grave error. It is bound to arouse suspicion abroad regarding the purpose of our educational program. Educational, scientific and cultural activities do not lend themselves to national propaganda. Money spent upon them is largely wasted if they are so regarded. They achieve their ends only as they succeed in enlisting the cooperative spirit of mankind. And this will never be possible so long as such activities are open to the charge of being used as instruments of power relations by individual nations. A

clean divorcement of the two functions, more than any other way, will convince the world of the integrity of this government's program of educational, scientific and cultural exchange.

Our second recommendation is that the Bill be amended to provide for the establishment of a committee or commission broadly representative of the educational, scientific and cultural life of the nation to advise the Department of State in all of its educational, scientific and cultural exchange activities. Since there is already in existence the United States Commission for UNESCO activities, it is suggested that instead of creating a second commission, the responsibilities of the UNESCO Commission might be enlarged to embrace all of the educational, scientific and cultural activities of the Department of State.

Again let me state the reasoning which has led to this second recommendation. It is obvious that a program of educational, scientific and cultural exchange, if it is to be effective, must stem from the authentic educational, scientific and cultural institutions of the country. In America, these, with minor exception, are not to be found in the national government. Throughout our history it has been the American tradition to divorce education and similar types of activities from the Federal Government in favor of their development under the auspices of state and local units of government, and private enterprise. This is not to say that national government agencies do not have a part to play in international cultural exchange, but in relation to the total educational and cultural resources of the nation their part is a minor one. It follows, therefore, that the chief function of the Department of State in these matters should be to stimulate, facilitate, and coordinate activities arising in all areas of the nation. A national advisory commission, properly chosen, should function as the liaison agency between the Department of State and the educational and cultural organizations of the country. It should be noted that the American people always have established special administrative arrangements to safeguard the functional efficiency and integrity of educational and cultural institutions. Boards of Regents or Trustees for colleges and universities will be found in every state, and even the smallest communities have their Boards of Education to safeguard that activity from the intrusion of irrelevant influences. Now that the United States

Government is proposing to engage on a large scale in international educational and scientific cooperation, there is needed a qualified national body to advise and safeguard this program just as Boards of Regents and Boards of Education are doing on the domestic level. Hence, our recommendation that the Bill provide for an appropriate national advisory commission, and the suggestion that the United States National Commission for UNESCO matters, with possible minor changes, might well perform this function. This appears logical since it is not improbable that nations at present outside UNESCO with whom the United States has bilateral cultural relations agreements will soon join the organization, thus identifying the bilateral projects with UNESCO's overall program.

On the organizational side in the Department of State our recommendation means that all international educational, scientific and cultural exchanges would be placed under the direction of an Assistant Secretary of State who possesses recognized competence in these matters. His sole responsibility would be to administer activities in this field with the advice of the national commission described above.

Information activities would be entirely separated from educational, scientific and cultural exchanges and placed under an officer possessing the special qualifications necessary for that type of service.

If the Bill is amended to incorporate these recommendations, it is our judgment that the colleges and universities of America will then be in a position to play a significant role in developing "the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind" which is so essential to lasting peace.

TOWARD "HIGHER" EDUCATION

A. R. KEPPEL

CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

AT THE end of the first day's deliberations of the United Nations General Assembly on September 16, 1947, a newspaperman buttonholed a delegate and said: "Would you say, sir, that this session is an eleventh-hour effort to hold the UN together?"

The silver-haired diplomat nodded: "Yes, it is an eleventh-hour effort. The Assembly convenes at eleven. Our delegation discusses plans until eleven every night. The UN schedule is geared to that hour. But I am not superstitious. We still have another hour to go."

In that reply, my friends, we have humor and tragedy well confused. The pertinence, however, of the illustration is the analogy which it seems to bear to the status of American higher education today. There are at present two million three hundred forty thousand students in our colleges and universities—an increase of roughly a million over our prewar high. "Prosperity is in the making," the average person observes—and yet I am not too certain that a scientific analysis of the product of our colleges and universities would not prompt the judicious and honest administrator to admit that unless certain focal objectives are changed—and changed promptly—the hope of true freedom may have only "an hour to go."

I am not a pessimist, nor do I wish to pose as an alarmist, but I contend in all sincerity that unless we, to whom has been entrusted the leadership of America's great bulwarks of freedom, address ourselves to the task of effectively establishing not only a valid core curriculum, but moreover, a Christian core objective for all college and university training, time will run out, and the freedom of men and of nations will be a futile issue.

Important and strategic as is the consideration of the subject of universal military training which has challenged our attention this morning, let us not deceive ourselves that the ultimate solution of that issue will thereby lay any substantial or permanent foundation stones of a new and better world. Nor can I believe that the mere objective acquisition of academic knowledge, no matter how scientific and sound, will in itself work any

miracles in our confused areas of political, social, and economic relationships.

True, American institutions of higher education have rightfully earned for themselves a coveted place among the really great "temples of learning" in the fields of the arts and sciences, but unless they also teach simultaneously moral values and Christian standards tuned to the eternal truths and teach ways of evaluating experience with such measuring rods, the ultimate worth of general and specific knowledge may well be negative instead of positive.

For instance, students in the field of commerce must indeed learn the principles of business and the technique of marketing and the psychology of advertising and the many other technical phases of that vocation, but such is not enough. They must, above all else, understand and be motivated to put into practice a Christian economic philosophy that comprehends business as a servant to the best interests of all rather than as a servant to the vested interests of self; a philosophy that puts a premium on co-operation and fair practices rather than on cunningness and shrewdness and ruthless competition.

Moreover, it is not enough that students in the field of science learn merely the laws of nuclear energy or the active elements of chemical compounds or the source and origin of disease germs or even develop the scientific mind. They must, above all else, understand how such knowledge can be used to serve the common good of all, and they must be imbued with the zeal to make their own contribution to such unselfish service.

Obviously, what I am here saying is in no degree new. If it possesses any semblance of newness, that semblance is due only to the fact that modern higher education has veered so far from its earliest tenet that present reference to this objective now merely makes it appear strange and foreign and new. It may be trite in such an audience as this to say that what is needed most today is not more education, but more of the right kind of education. It may be equally trite to say, in the words of Committee II of the Teachers College Conference on the Education of Youth in America, that "the ultimate aim of education is a good man—not merely a good citizen or a good doctor or a good salesman or a good breadwinner, but just a good man." These may be trite

pronouncements, but I am willing that they be so labeled if, in their triteness, they may again be accepted as valid, essential, and basic objectives for today's development of college and university youth.

As I have said, I do not mean to speak disparagingly of the work of our American institutions of higher education, for they have written some glorious chapters of achievement, but I am truly alarmed by such youth reactions as the one voiced to me recently by a college senior, who, in the course of a casual conversation concerning his future, said: "I've had a hard time so far in life. I've gotten where I am the hard way! Nobody has ever given me anything for nothing. So believe me, when I finish here, and get out into the world of business I'm going to get even! I'm going to make the world pay me!"

And, by way of further documentation of this same type of student reaction, may I quote the response of a college junior to a question relative to the honor system—a question posed by the Christian Association of a certain so-called Christian school. This student wrote as follows: "Everybody cheats! Even industry and government are today built upon the principle of misrepresentation and propaganda. If we are to take our places in such a society, we cannot get our experience too soon! Sure I cheat, whenever I get the chance!"

This is not an isolated case, for I quote it from a statistical summary which would seem to prove that such a reaction is typical of approximately one-third of the particular student group making reply on this unsigned comment sheet.

I ask you as I ask myself, "Of what use academic knowledge without a sense of moral values and Christian standards by which to evaluate all knowledge and by which to achieve the Good Life?"

Someone has paradoxically said, "Education is that which is left after one has forgotten all that he has learned." That statement carries a profound implication which is too often disregarded in today's vocational and professional trend of training. Ellis H. Dana puts it in these words:

"During the past two decades, there has been a lack of vision of American destiny and a lack of a unifying spirit. The privately endowed colleges and universities have become materialistic. Too often they have distorted their purposes and rationalized their positions."

And turning again to the report of Committee II of the Teachers College Conference on The Education of Youth, the following thought seems to me to deserve paramount emphasis:

"When scientists fissioned the atom they fused the world and committed humanity to the proposition that brotherly love is now not only righteous but necessary. It is universal brotherhood or universal death, and education bears no greater responsibility than the one to teach the likeness and the loveableness of all men everywhere."

The crux of the problem seems to me to be not an unwillingness on the part of educational leaders to subscribe to a Christian dynamic as the focal point of worthy education, but rather an inertia and perhaps a fear to make such a dynamic an active, correlating force in the total program of American higher education. If we believe in one God and if we believe in Christian ideals, let us not apologize for making these the central tenets and the conditioning factors in the development, through higher education, of "good men." Only if our colleges and universities recapture such a Christian core objective can education hope to change a confused and frustrated world into an orderly and just and peaceful brotherhood of men.

Let me say again that I am not pessimistic, for there are ample signs on the educational horizon today of a growing awareness of such a reconversion of educational philosophy and practice. Although the need is desperate, the present trend of thought seems to reflect the spirit of the diplomat at the UN Assembly, when he said, "Eleventh hour, yes; but we have another hour to go."

Concrete evidence that American education is aware and determined to act can be found not only in current writings and official reports of committees and commissions, but in the very acts of this Association, when for instance, at its session a year ago, it voted unanimously to expand substantially the work of its Commission on Christian Higher Education and approved unanimously the employment of a full-time executive secretary and the establishment of four divisional committees: one on Conferences and Programs; one on Publications; one on Public Relations and one on Research.

It is my very great pleasure to report to you that the Administrative Committee of this Commission, acting upon instructions

of the Association, is now fully organized to address itself to its expanded task and to initiate an aggressive and scientific program of work to the end that effective emphasis may be given to the fundamental place of religion in higher education (a) in the promotion of a Christian philosophy of life, (b) in the development of Christian character in the individual, and (c) in the establishment of a Christian social order.

As the director of the Commission's work, I am delighted to announce the appointment of the Rev. Robert N. DuBose, formerly Director of Religious Activities at Duke University. He comes to this position with a rich background of training and experience and a zeal essential to the successful achievement of the crucial task which faces each of us as college and university teachers and administrators. The Commission bespeaks for him your earnest and wholehearted co-operation.

But I would be ungrateful and untrue to my own personal feeling, if I should fail to voice again for myself and for you, the sincere appreciation of the pioneering work which has been done in this field through the years by our highly esteemed colleague, Dr. Gould Wickey. On part time and almost single-handedly, he has carried the burden of this work for the past thirteen years, and we are deeply grateful to him for the foundation which he has helped to lay and which now will stand in such good stead for the expanded program which lies ahead. Following this presentation, Dr. Wickey will bring to you in retrospect an account of the past year's activities and will present in prospect the plans of the new divisional committees.

May I also express deep appreciation to our genial and efficient Executive Director of this Association, Dr. Guy Snavelly, who has shared so much of his time and effort, during the past year, with the members of the Administrative Committee of this Commission in the reorganization of the Commission's program, and who now will work so intimately with the Commission's new Executive Secretary.

*Never has the Association's horizon of "religion in education" been brighter and never has there been a seemingly greater awareness of the urgency of the task. Without the Christian core, education is not only futile, but dangerous. With it, great souls will rise to lead the world aright.

THE INTELLECTUAL'S CRISIS IN RELIGION

HAROLD A. BOSLEY

DEAN, DIVINITY SCHOOL, DUKE UNIVERSITY

THERE is a great gulf fixed between the idea of John Henry Newman and that of the authors of the Harvard report on *General Education in a Free Society* as to the proper place and meaning of religion in the life of an educated individual. Newman was clear that religion, particularly the authoritarian faith which he himself had adopted, was central, and that no man could claim to be educated unless he embraced it.

While the authors of the Harvard report write at length about many of the values that have been won and preserved for us primarily through the insights and institutions of religion, they finally and with a candor that compels respect from those among us who disagree with them, deny that religion can aid modern man or the modern educational institutions as they search for order, unity, and importance in life. Here is their conclusion to the matter:

Alluding to "an enormous variety of aim and method among colleges as a whole," they continue:

This condition, which seemingly robs liberal education of any clear, coherent meaning, has for some time disturbed people and prompted a variety of solutions. Sectarian, particularly Roman Catholic, colleges have of course their solution, which was generally shared by American colleges until less than a century ago: namely, the conviction that Christianity gives meaning and ultimate unity to all parts of the curriculum, indeed to the whole life of the college. Yet this solution is out of the question in publicly supported colleges and is practically, if not legally impossible in most others. Some think it the Achilles' heel of democracy that, by its very nature, it cannot foster general agreement on ultimates, and perhaps must foster the contrary. But whatever one's views, religion is not now for most colleges a practicable source of intellectual unity. (Page 39)

I would like to repeat that last sentence: "But whatever one's views, religion is not now for most colleges a practicable source of intellectual unity," since it is an excellent statement of the problem on which I shall be speaking today. I think it important

that we seek to understand why men of the caliber of those who made the Harvard report reached this conclusion. And, if we think they are wrong—as I do—we must be scrupulously careful to give our reasons with as much cogency as they give theirs.

I do not want to give the impression that this is to be a debate between groups of professors, some of whom believe that religion has a central place in higher education and some of whom do not. Conceivably, that would be an important discussion, but the one at hand is much more important. For we must confront one of the deepest problems of our day—one that affects many if not most of us here today—and ask what religion has to say about it. If you reach the conclusion, as I do, that religion has something of unparalleled importance to say to beleaguered modern man and his civilization, then you will have the answer to the question as to whether religion has a place in the educational processes of a people. How to define that place, how to provide for it within the framework of our public schools and form of government—these are real but secondary questions. I am convinced that if we could reach some kind of agreement on the importance of religion in life, we could and would work out the important but secondary matters of how best to let religion's word be effectively spoken and heard in our educational process. I do not mean to minimize, thereby, the importance of these matters, but I do regard them as being distinctly secondary to the main problem of the intellectual's crisis in religion.

Many contemporary intellectuals find themselves in a hopeless predicament. This is their problem: How guide their lives by personal and social purpose in a world which they feel to be devoid of ultimate purpose? The confused state of their quest for a purpose sufficiently compelling to integrate their loyalties speaks for itself. Some seek to solve the problem by excessive activity within their special fields and are known in the earlier stages as "promising young thinkers" and in the latter stages as "tired young intellectuals." Others lift high the banner of some great social cause and endeavor to rally their confused comrades round it. (The mass movements of our day owe them their leadership.) All too few realize that one of the perennial functions of religion has been to rescue intellectuals from precisely this *cul-de-sac*; that it has the light and leading they so sorely need; that it is languish-

ing for lack of what they have to offer as truly as they languish for lack of what it can contribute.

As I shall be using it, the term "intellectual" connotes neither disparagement nor commendation. It is rather an attempt at accurate description. *The intellectual is one who strives to see facts in their context.* He believes that the objects of his interest can be understood only when viewed as integral aspects of a larger whole.

One of the major fights of his life is against the sin of oversimplification. In this, he knows, lies the power and the peril of yellow journalism, mob action, the frenzied appeals of demagogues in all walks of life. Consequently he is prepared to oppose it on all fronts even though the charges of "pedantry" and "academic" be heaped upon him by the self-styled realists and practical souls.

Aristotle disposes of the non-intellectual in a single cutting sentence: "He who takes only a few things into account finds it easy to pronounce judgment." Matthew Arnold's celebrated description of Sophocles may well be taken as the end and aim of all intellectual endeavor: "He saw life steadily and saw it whole."

Although our entire educational procedure is now under a withering fire, much of which is richly deserved, it has been and continues to be one vast laboratory for the nurture of intellectuals, of persons who are trained to see some phenomena, at least, as aspects of a larger whole. It is only fair to say that the sole reason for the professional existence of universities and libraries, and of professors and the books they write is their ability accurately to indicate perspectives on fields of facts. The expert is one who sees the underlying, the more comprehensive relationships of a special field. The geologist moves from a stone to a stratum to a formative epoch in the earth's crust. The social scientist begins with an institution, say the family; he considers it from the angle of its development; he contrasts the form which prevails in our culture with that which obtains in others; he considers the disruptive tendencies within the present institutional structure, such as divorce rate, later marriage age, and changing moral conventions regarding sex behavior.

The fundamental aim of education is to emancipate us from the domination of passing sensations, impulses and desires. This it

does by teaching us to seek the meaning of the things we experience, believe, and strive for in their broadest context. More and more the leaders in the field of education are coming to agreement on the point that, if education is to escape the provincialism of specialization, it must result in some sort of world-view, some kind of conception of the total life enterprise.

Needless to say, education so conceived is immediately beset by the peril of accepting some one world-view as final and devoting its energies to securing acceptance of that viewpoint. An apologist is notoriously deficient in self-criticism. An educational system that is long on exposition and evangelism is bound to be short on comprehension and criticism. The school systems of totalitarian regimes are a case in point. They teach a world-view, one dictated by political or economic or national considerations. History and science are rewritten, not to mention falsified, in order to bolster that world-view. Consequently the products of these schools are not so much intellectuals as addicts.

We who are interested in religion heavily underscore the notion that the intellectual has fallen short of his logical development unless he finally arrives at a world-view. But those of us from empirical backgrounds are incorrigibly suspicious of any known world-view that is so rigidly complete that it tries to give the lie to the value and validity of growth through experience. In other words we feel, to adapt the thought of the Pilgrim Pastor Robinson, that "new light" is always breaking forth in the area of human experience. We must insist that every known world-view have a growing edge, that it shall not be placed above and beyond the criticisms of cumulative experience and reflection. Because religion is the prolific mother of world-views of one sort or another, the quest of the intellectual is not and can not be considered complete until and unless he has come to terms with the place and meaning of religion in his own world-view. This is precisely what most intellectuals have not done. We can safely say that the most far-reaching crisis which confronts them today springs from their indecision and ignorance regarding religion. We are beginning to realize that there is something fundamentally dangerous rather than merely anomalous about a man who while an expert in economics, let us say, muddles along with no religion or with scant regard for it, or with a ten-year-old conception of it.

Yet that is precisely the situation in which many if not most of our intellectuals find themselves today. This, more than anything else, is the reason why some sort of systematic presentation of the world-view of religion be a standard part of educational procedure!

I can't say I blame the educator, trained as he is in either arts, sciences, or philosophy, who moves cautiously when he approaches religion. For religion has had several pitched battles with all three disciplines within the last five hundred years. These major periods of conflict continue to loom large in modern culture: the Renaissance, when religion, proud mistress of the minds and souls of men for fourteen centuries, found herself challenged by a revolt of the entire range of the arts; the Enlightenment, when philosophy, emboldened by the rich fruition of minds like Bacon, Descartes, Hume, Kant and others drew up and made good her declaration of independence from religion; the Nineteenth Century, when scientific method laid "profane" hands on the problems of the origin and nature of man, a province hitherto gladly left to religion. In none of these ages did religion quietly abdicate. Led by doughty warriors whose zeal for the faith of their fathers far outstripped their appreciative insight into the values of the opposition, she plunged into the fray. Not only were the torments of hell paraded before the eyes of the unbelievers, but in an appalling number of cases generous samples of what it would be like were served up here on earth. It is a long, dark, sickening story and illustrates why educators are wary of religion. They would rather, in Edmund Goss's delightful phrase, "let sleeping dogmas lie."

Nevertheless, the end product of our schools, the intellectuals, individually and collectively, can be rescued from aimlessness only by getting a firm grasp on two emphases that are fundamentally religious in nature: (1) human values are neither optional nor arbitrary but are organic to the universe; (2) the achievement of these values is a social process. When I say the intellectual needs these religious affirmations, I am of course, assuming that when he surveys the human scene, he is moved to do something about the problems which harass men.

My belief in his integrity compels me to assume, in the first place, that he sees at least some of these problems; in the second

place, that he wants to do something about them; and in the third place, that he is wondering what religion has to offer under the circumstances.

The fundamental thing it offers is the insistence that the human values, indicated by the great classic concepts, Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Love, some or all of which the intellectual may respect, are not simply human constructions but indicate certain actual and possible relationships between man and the rest of nature. Life as it expresses itself in and through man is a definite yet dynamic thing. It changes—yet through the changes maintains its identity.

Most of us will unhesitatingly affirm that health is a human value, yet it is far from a purely human construction. It is in reality a very complex pattern of inter-relationships between man and his world, involving breathing, eating, drinking, sleeping, playing, working, and many complicating physiological processes. While we may define health any way we please, we cannot be healthy by doing whatever we choose, unless we choose wisely. Life speaks the final word on all our definitions, in this and every other phase of living.

The same hard truth holds for the great values, Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Love. They are human constructions insofar as they represent our groping efforts to discover and clarify the meaning of life, actual and potential. Yet they are more, much more, than human creations, for they are attempts to describe a relationship which does exist in some measure and may through wise choices and purposive living exist in greater measure. Wherever and whenever you find life, regardless of form or level of existence, you find adaptations designed to sustain and promote the continuity of the structure. Though life on the human level is so complex that we, with all of our science, have only begun to explore its mysteries, it manifests that same primal urge to sustain and promote itself by adjustments to the total environment. Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Love are ways of describing certain types of adjustments, certain modes of relationship, which we have discovered in part, and which invite further exploration and experimentation.

And there are other concepts, opposites of the ones just mentioned: deception, ugliness, meanness, and hatred, which likewise

connote certain relationships which man can and does sustain to the world. And the difference between these two sets of relationships is determined by what happens to life when it is enmeshed in them. The relationships gathered into the categories of Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Love progressively enrich life; they move in the direction of the more abundant life; one in which the capacities of men are discovered, nurtured, and brought to rich fruition; one characterized by health rather than sickness, wisdom rather than ignorance, brotherliness rather than condescension, understanding rather than prejudice. Conversely, the relationships which are instances of deception, ugliness, meanness, and hatred progressively strip life of meaning and worth and finally destroy the very thing they feed on.

The Christian religion centers attention upon the value-structure of the universe, calling it God, and insists that the abundant life flows from one type of interaction with this, rather than another. To the doubter it can only say: try and see. If you can be healthy without conforming, consciously or not, to the laws of well-being which are implicit in our personalities; if you can enjoy deep friendships without conforming, consciously or not, to the laws governing personal association which, though we know them only in part, are implicit in our structure; if you can create the Great Society without paying strict and humble attention to the laws of personal and social growth which are implicit in human beings and societies—in short, if you can succeed in living a full and abundant life governed by the hypothesis that

I am the master of my fate
I am the captain of my soul

then religion has nothing more to say. Religion has never paid much attention to verbal atheism—to the man who says there is no God; but it has always been profoundly stirred by ethical atheism—by the man who acts as though there were no God. It has consistently submitted its fundamental conviction that there is a value-structure implicit in nature to the test of action, of life. "By their fruits shall ye know them."

Religion offers the intellectual a way, and the only way, out of the bewilderment and cynicism which so easily beset him by confronting him with a categorical imperative in the form of a consciousness of work to be done. It is idle to talk about "purposive

living" apart from a sense of *ought-ness*, a conviction of purpose in life, which is its very foundation. Something worth living for, something worth committing oneself to, body, mind and soul, something worth dying for swims into the ken of the intellectual when he couples with his vision of work to be done the profoundly rational and mystical consciousness that the reason it ought to be done derives from the very structure of the universe as it comes to expression in human life.

This, then, is the first and the great contribution of religion to the intellectual: his purposes and the purpose of God can coincide, for as Whitehead reminds us, "The Purpose of God is the achievement of Value in the temporal world." The second contribution is closely related to the first, and can be stated this way: the achievement of human values is a profoundly social process.

The Christian religion is not only prepared to recognize the point now agreed upon by social psychologists that we are children of nature, and that our self is a social creation, but it pushes on to make that most profound of all affirmations of our social nature, namely that we are sons of God and brothers one of another. It draws a single staggering ethical corollary from this affirmation: the only way to approach God is by serving, through love, our fellowmen. Ethical religion, then, is a call to action, social action, in terms of problems, social problems, in the name and for the sake of God, the value-structure of the universe. "No one observatory is equal to the tasks of astronomy," says a famous astronomer. Neither is any one man, or group of men, or culture equal to the task of discovering the fuller meaning of Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Love in terms of the problems of our day. This is a shared undertaking, broad enough to include and profit by the contributions of all sincere and intelligent men everywhere. It lays every sensitive spirit and discerning mind under obligation to share the best that he has without thought or restraint or reward and continually to refine in the fires of life what he thinks best. If these great values are to be anything more than ivory towers in which we hide while storms engulf the world of men, then all men who are in search of them must join hands.

One of the noblest instances of goodness of which Chicago boasts is Hull House. Although we always, and rightly, think of Jane Addams when we think of Hull House, it far transcends

the work of any one person's hands. One of Jane Addam's long suits was her ability as a social engineer; for she channelled into her project the hope, aspirations, and aid of unnumbered thousands of others. Hull House is what it is today because it is the product of the shared efforts of all these folk. Without some such institution those hopes, aspirations, and efforts which have gone into its effectiveness would have been ephemeral, inchoate, useless. When gasoline explodes in a chamber created to conserve its power, appropriate action results. If it explodes anywhere else, a flash, heat, and smoke occur, and it all adds up to either destruction or uselessness.

The great religions of the world are great precisely because they have mastered this principle of the production and direction of human energies. Without exception they have created a "body of believers," a church, which not only strives to evoke mystic rapport with God and make a rational statement of its faith, but which, in addition, turns the energies thus generated toward the solution of social problems. Such an organization molds the believers into a mystic whole which is preeminently practical in that the unique contribution of each believer is integrated in and directed by common loyalties and goals. The organization trains its leaders and educates its members in the faith, and constantly reconsecrates itself to the cause it serves.

The Christian Church with all its faults, and they are many and grievous, is the social institution in our culture which is dedicated to the task of making the ethical insights of the Christian religion socially effective. Many intellectuals feel that the church is so immersed in traditionalism, so entangled with the *status quo*, that it cannot speak an effective word toward social reform.

Before relegating the church to the museum the intellectual should spend some time studying the present state of the church. When this is done he cannot avoid seeing two facts: (1) more water has gone under the bridge of religion in the last fifty years than in any other quarter-century since the Reformation; the entire church structure, ecclesiastical, theological, and ethical, is in a condition of rapid and epoch-making change; (2) the church with its profound prophetic tradition is registering the strongest sort of protest against the exploitation of human values by social and political organizations for narrow and vicious ends. We

should not claim too much for the churches in this matter but neither should we claim too little. Long after the labor organizations, dissenting political factions, and the educational system had been "coordinated" by the Nazi government, the "church-problem" remained, and remained to the end, as one of the great unsolved internal problems in all such states. This simple fact, which occasions no surprise in one acquainted with Christian history, confronts the intellectual with a challenge that he cannot ignore with good conscience.

I have tried not to give the impression that the intellectuals are simply to be on the receiving end of religion. That would be untrue. Organized religion needs the intellectuals as badly as they need its affirmations and its fellowship. It needs their information, their ability to approach with disciplined method and thought those areas which they have studied and are studying; it needs the tremendous potency of life—past, present, and future—which, in measure, throbs through their training and personalities. They can bring objectivity and information about concrete problems into the area of religion and these alone can beat down some of our inherited superstitions and prejudices. Religion in turn can bring confidence, conviction, and humility into their life, giving them the challenge of worship and the comradeship of purposive living.

The intellectuals' crisis in religion, then, is brought on by the fact that they must choose between these alternatives: either reject religion and wander about in a world where values are optional or arbitrary and where nothing really matters—where, as one who chose this course said, "After all, life's quite pointless, isn't it?"; or accept the insight of religion as to the cosmic nature of values and the social nature of their realization and throw their total energies into the church, reforming and energizing it, enabling it to regain a position of vital leadership in the creation of that society which will yet come into existence on this our earth, providing always that we all have courage and humility enough to yield to the formative purpose of God, who says, as to men of old, "Choose ye this day."

After the fashion of McGuffey, there are the morals of this talk, for us who are engaged in public education. The morals of education may not be as easily reached or as simply stated as Mr.

McGuffey thought, but there are "morals" to be drawn from every significant branch of the educational process—and the existence of the moral to be found and drawn is the reason for the importance of the process.

1. While we can and must draw a careful and discriminating line between Church and State, we must be equally careful not to draw—or to appear to draw—a line between religion and life. To do this would be to fly in the face of every known fact about religion and life.

2. An effective general education is and must be fundamentally an education in values. It must be a discipline in discovering the distinctions between truth and falsehood, fact and fancy, good and evil, right and wrong; or to put it in our own parlance, between that which is creative and that which is disintegrative, between that which is enduring and that which is evanescent.

3. These values are neither optional nor arbitrary but are organic aspects of the world. To know them even in part is to have glimpsed the true meaning of the dignity and warmth of life and work. To seek to know them better and to sense them more completely is to seek the good life and the good society.

This, as I understand it, is the aim of education—and I know it is the heart of religion.

TRENDS AND TASKS

GOULD WICKEY

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

ORGANIZED in 1935 with a membership of fifty-six colleges, the predecessor of this Commission, the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges, has been active during the past thirteen years in emphasizing the place of religion in education, especially at the college level. Today, participating in the program and benefits of this Commission are all of the 635 college members of the Association of American Colleges; also, 88 church-related colleges which are not members of the Association.

Pending the selection of a full-time executive secretary, the activities of the past year, on a very limited time schedule, included the news bulletin, *College and Church*, articles in the journal, *Christian Education*, news items in the bulletin of the Association, an article for the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, participation in four college conferences, and an extensive investigation of enrolments.

The activities of the past decade have been influential in impressing the importance of a united front for the cause of Christian higher education. On that foundation a significant structure of service may be built in the future. The nature of that structure may be seen in a consideration of some trends and tasks.

I. SOME TRENDS AFFECTING HIGHER EDUCATION

1. *Increased Interest in Higher Education*

One of the phenomena of this century is the post-high school enrolments in all colleges and universities, amounting in October 1947 to 2,328,495, which is an increase of 12.9 per cent over the figures of October 1946, according to the United States Office of Education. From our own investigation, we have learned that the average enrolment in church-related colleges in March 1945 was 554; in March 1947, 855; and in November 1947, 960. According to an extensive sampling, church-related colleges have experienced a larger percentage of increase in enrolment during this academic year than did the state schools. In fact, there is

some evidence that there is a larger percentage of the total enrolment in church-related and independent schools than was true two years ago.

Another interesting trend is the number of Catholic students enrolled in Protestant colleges. One group of fourteen colleges had in 1937 a Catholic enrolment of 254, or 5.4 per cent, while in 1947 the Catholic enrolment was 995, or 9.2 per cent. It should be added that most church-related colleges have a larger distribution of students from other denominations today than five years ago.

The increase in enrolments is expected to continue for some time, because of the large birth-rate, the demands of business and industry for college men, the emphasis placed by the military forces upon post-high school education, and the possibility of government scholarships and fellowships.

Those interested in Christian higher education see in these facts an unusual opportunity for service in leadership-training for both Church and Country, the possibility of larger co-operation in the field of education within and among church groups, and the necessity for continued studies for achieving larger and more effective service.

The Church has a stake in the enrolment situation, since some 88 per cent come from church homes, according to reports from 1,458 colleges and universities a few years ago.

2. Pattern of Institutions of Higher Education

It is recognized generally that the future pattern of institutions of higher education will include: the large state and private universities, the liberal arts colleges, and the junior and technical colleges, both tax-supported and independent.

By precept and example, religious faith must be effective in all types of schools. Through the more than 2,000 church workers with students, the spiritual values are held high on all campuses, as well as through the host of Christian faculty members and administrators.

The churches make a great contribution to higher education through their liberal arts colleges, both four-year and two-year, of which there are some 796. Here is laid the foundation for the great professions of the ministry, teaching medicine, and law.

Here is the backbone for an increased and extended religious culture basic for the perpetuity of our American way of life.

Through the junior colleges, the churches can reach a great mass of students at the home base, guiding them in vocational choices and making more effective their contributions to their communities. Here is an opportunity for the churches to be a significant factor in the adult education movement.

Students are more interested in the study of religion than was the case ten years ago. The colleges of the Church believe in required courses in Bible and religion.

3. Crisis in College Teaching

At all levels of education more teachers are needed. Last year, to care for the increased enrolment in higher education, 66,000 teachers should have been added to the faculties of colleges and universities. And yet, the universities produced only 3,800 Ph.D.'s and about 15,000 Masters.

Those interested in the cause of Christian higher education find in this situation the responsibility for encouraging youth to enter the field of education, for increasing salaries so that the profession will be more secure, for offering opportunities within the profession for self-development, for obtaining more women on college faculties, and for developing a program of financial aid through church fellowships for outstanding youth to do graduate work.

4. Demand for Counselling and Guidance

This is nothing new in college circles, but it has assumed the proportions of a national movement. The military forces in World War II used trained counselors, with desirable results. Industry employs individuals capable of guiding employers and employees to larger efficiency and co-operation.

The medical profession sees the need for the trained psychologist in dealing with the health of people. The possibilities and dangers in this field are shown by the fact that there are 25,000 psycho-quacks in this country, according to an article in the *New York Times*, dated October 19, 1947. While there are only 4,500 bona fide psychiatrists and 400 psychoanalysts, it is stated that there is need for 10,000 psychiatrists and 10,000 psychoanalyst social workers.

Our colleges always have declared that education must meet life needs: intellectual, vocational, social, and religious. But many colleges have been more consistent in the profession of this responsibility than in the practice of meeting the need. Colleges and universities should have trained counselors with no disciplinary functions. To these, students will be more inclined to unburden their souls.

But counselors must be carefully trained and selected. Too many of them now being trained are secularists, or have become secularists, who judge all conduct primarily on the basis of sex, and have little respect for or give little attention to religious values. Two recent books, *Psychology in Living*, by Wendell White, and *New Fields of Psychiatry*, by David M. Levy, apparently are not aware of the part which religious faith can play in integrating personalities and in developing wholesome lives.

5. Secularism

The secularist is one who denies God's place in the world and has no place for religious values. The extensive spread of secularism in the schools today is due to a large material development, to a behavioristic psychology, to a superficial progressive education, and to a so-called scientific liberalism in theology.

The secularism of today is seen in the *materialism*, which puts possessions above service, and things above human welfare; *mechanism*, which relies upon the effectiveness of the machine and forgets the man behind the machine; *militarism*, which assumes that the United States will be attacked and that compulsory peacetime military training will prevent defeat and guarantee security; *humanism*, which estimates all progress and development as the handiwork of man whose life here is the whole of existence; and *totalitarianism*, which requires that all activity and conduct shall be for the sake of the government, and that the government confers all rights upon the individual.

If America is to play an effective role in world affairs, and if our American leaders are to guide those affairs aright, then our colleges and universities, in all departments, must re-emphasize the place of religious values in all human relations. Through youth so trained we shall experience atomic living which will shatter the materialism in philosophy, the behaviorism in psychology, the relativism in ethics, and the paganism in conduct.

II. SOME TASKS

Possible tasks for this Commission were mentioned in summarizing some trends. These tasks may be described in light of the special Committees of the Administrative Board of the Commission.

1. *Conferences and Programs*

Here's the heart of the work of the Commission. Regional and national programs are means of getting close to the problems of the individual schools. Closely related are state associations and councils, and special institutes conducted by individual institutions. Here, too, the Commission may function as an integrating factor and be of service in program-making.

As for individual institutions, the Commission believes that representatives ought to visit campuses, receiving and giving information as to religious-emphasis weeks, courses in religion, philosophy and the social sciences, chapel programs, Sunday worship services, and directors of religious activities. The Commission would encourage the various church bodies in underwriting the salaries and expenses of such directors of religious activities.

2. *Promotion and Public Relations*

In the words of President Levering Tyson, of Muhlenberg College, many institutions are "likely to issue a lot of material which is interesting intramurally but does not make a dent on outsiders. The result is that many so-called public relation systems bog down by reason of the weight of their own mechanics." So the Commission is inclined to stress regional conferences as an effective promotional medium, and then to follow up such conferences with an effective publication program. Also, the Commission can do something in assisting colleges to obtain desirable teachers.

3. *Publications*

The Commission sees its task as one of encouraging individuals and groups in writing and publishing articles and books on the general subject of education and religion. Frequently, outstanding addresses can be given extensive circulation. Articles in certain leading magazines will be another objective for this Commission.

4. Research

The Commission proposes to be alert to what is being written and to the research in the whole field of education and religion. Quite frequently articles and books have an underlying philosophy which is anti-Christian. The colleges and universities of the country will be kept informed of such items. At the same time, the Commission hopes to encourage such researches and writings as will place education and religion in their proper relation.

CONCLUSION

A few years ago, mankind was thrilled with Wendell Willkie's message of *One World*. But many neglected to note carefully Willkie's statement upon his return from that globe-circling tour. After referring to outstanding military officials and statesmen with whom he had interviews, he said, "But it is no exaggeration to say that Dr. Dodge gave me more hope and confidence for the future of these regions than all the others combined." Why this laudatory statement of Dr. Bayard Dodge, the former President of the American University of Beirut? Here was a Christian educator participating in a program of molding youth for the responsibilities of world citizenship.

So, in such a day as this, with its varied trends and their resulting tasks, the Commission on Christian Higher Education would challenge American youth and adults in all colleges and universities to a dedication to a personal, eternal God, to a larger appreciation of human values in all relations, to a complete and unreserved reconciliation to God and man, and to a liberation which gives freedom from ignorance and for expression of truth everywhere, freedom from fear and for co-operation, freedom from want and for individual achievement, and freedom from superstition and for religious worship. Then in the world neighborhood of today shall exist a world brotherhood tomorrow.

SYMPOSIUM ON PUBLIC RELATIONS

RAYMOND WALTERS

PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

WE FOUR on this platform have been asked to discuss the relations of colleges and universities with the American public.

As chairman I shall undertake to define and limit the scope of our topic. During my years as a teacher of English composition, I often found it useful in my classes to employ the obverse method in definition—to say what the thing is not before saying what it is. Since there are widespread misimpressions regarding the term “public relations,” let us clear the ground by ruling out two such misimpressions:

1. Public relations, as we interpret them, do *not* mean simply publicity for our institutions—lots of space in newspapers and magazines and lots of time in radio broadcasts, valuable as these media are.

2. Public relations do *not* mean merely utilizing expert methods of staff organization and distribution of information, useful as these methods are.

Affirmatively, public relations represent the sum total of impressions which the American people receive regarding colleges and universities as a whole, and then more specifically, the impressions which our clientele hold regarding our particular institution. Fundamentally, such impressions must depend upon the purposes and accomplishment of the institution and these impressions cannot rise above the wisdom of our purposes and the efficiency of our work. You will hear from Mr. Brandon the sound doctrine that public relations represent not the job of a single agency, but teamwork by the faculty, student body, and the alumni as well as by administrators and trustees. Representative of the two great allies of education, the press and radio—Mr. Fine and Mr. Herrick—will consider specific aspects of these allied contributions.

It is about the broad rather than the specific aspects of our topic that I shall now speak.

We need, I suggest, to clarify our broad purposes as a preliminary to presenting them in the popular form required for

public relations. The cardinal obligation and the thrilling opportunity of the college and university in twentieth century America is to spread beyond the confines of classroom and campus union the great ideas with which our institution must be concerned if it is to be not just a wholesome country club for young people but a true seat of learning. In an era of change and peril, when national and world issues demand the best of our knowledge, the best of our intellectual and professional skills, and the best of our spiritual powers, the college and the university can guide America as never before.

By holding this conception of greatness steadfastly before us, we of the colleges can avoid triviality and cheapness in our programs of public relations. I do not, in humorless fashion, mean to rule out "campus activities" and public reports about them. Such activities are the delight of our college students, of whom the co-eds are happily, in Wordsworth's phrase, creatures "not too bright or good, for human nature's daily food." Social affairs and athletics in the variegated forms found on every campus—yes! Report them in the papers—certainly!

All I advocate is that we place first things first in an enlarged conception of public relations.

What, in this realm of first things, are purposes which our colleges and universities may hold in common in respect to public relations? I venture, out of many, to propose four:

One common purpose (which probably would poll first in respect to popular interest) may well be to explain, as well as to contribute to, the values of science and of scientific method. Most practical of these values are the contributions which science and her handmaidens, technology and scientific agriculture, have made to the physical well-being and prosperity of the American people. To duplicate on a world-wide scale the scientific marvels which have raised living standards in the United States becomes the challenging opportunity of the new era of atomic fission. Thus hope shines forth that we can obviate much of the friction and the pressures which have been historic causes of war: lack of food and facilities for decent living.

If the physical sciences afford a basis for the supply of goods, the social sciences, including business administration, may in time provide for their adequate distribution. Our faculties in the

social sciences have a magnificent role to play in the creative development of economic and social theory and in cooperation with industry, business and government in practical applications. To combine inventiveness, objectivity and reasonableness becomes their great opportunity for public relations.

A third common purpose of colleges and universities—and in this the liberal arts colleges of this Association should lead—is the purpose to promote and to proclaim the values of the subjects we call the humanities. New vistas have been opened for us in the words of President Conant of Harvard and of Professor Jacques Barzun of Columbia. Speaking as a scientist before this Association at Boston a year ago, Mr. Conant saw glowing possibilities for the humanities—"study of art, literature and general philosophy of previous ages." The humanist, he declared, stands at the threshold of an exciting and expanding era.

Those who speak as if the humanities were fighting a rear-guard action in these days of science and technology and the common man, to my mind completely misunderstand the current scene. . . . The challenge of democracy to humanism is a trumpet call for action to which able and imaginative young men are now responding.

In a recent address at Columbia, Mr. Barzun classified both scientist and humanist as the scholar who "is an institution as old as society itself." The dogmas, "the firm convictions which go to make up a national culture" ultimately lead back to the scholar. In the twentieth century American scholarship faces the double problem, Mr. Barzun said, of furnishing "an original product" and also of assisting "in the dissemination of that product. The original scholar, the investigator of supreme skill and divinatorial instinct . . . will always evoke the highest admiration." Needed likewise is "the true scholar" who is also "the synthesizer and transmitter . . . a creator in a different dimension."

Akin to the stirring power of the humanities is a fourth objective which applies especially to the church-related colleges of this Association, but is pertinent also for individual faculty members of other institutions who possess a sense of religious values. This is the objective of transmitting the thought that man does not live by bread alone, of helping to meet the spiritual hunger of mankind.

How public relations purposes such as I have suggested can be realized now becomes the subject of the three very able specialists in public relations who are to address you. Professor Brandon will doubtless indicate the expanding scope of part-time and evening students whereby the living presence of the teacher is extended to the adult population of the community and state. Mr. Herrick will tell how the authentic spoken word can be spread to audiences far and wide. The representative of the press will make it clear that, far from being eclipsed by the broadcasted word, the printed word today has greater circulation than ever before. Of the pleasing fact that the press perceives that education is news, our next speaker is an illustrious witness. In combining news sense and educational values, no man in American journalism surpasses him. It is my pleasure to present the author of several significant books and of uncounted reports and feature articles, the alert and affable education editor of the *New York Times*, Dr. Benjamin Fine.

THE PRESS AND HIGHER EDUCATION

BENJAMIN FINE

EDUCATIONAL EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES

A SOUND program of public relations is necessary in higher education today. Too often colleges do not call in their public relations men until they have made a vital decision. After you have taken an important step you may call in your director and say: Here is what we have done, now you go ahead and see that it gets into the papers so that it won't do us any harm. In that case, you are treating your public relations director as a glorified messenger boy; you are not utilizing his expert advice on matters of policy.

I am making a plea at this time for a higher status for the college public relations man. He should receive the respect due his important station. A college that understands the importance of public relations will not employ a man and then put him in a minor spot on the campus.

Rather, the good public relations director should be the right hand man of the administration. He should be on the top policy board, and should be consulted before an important step is taken, not after. This means, of course, that higher standards are necessary in the public relations profession. It means higher salaries and greater campus recognition. Many institutions now give the public relations director the rank of full professor or assistant to the president. That is certainly desirable if you are to get the right person for the job.

But that is not always done. I recall an eastern college, in search of a public relations man, which turned, as an economy measure, to its English instructor and said: "You have gone to Harvard. You've taken a course in English. You once worked on your school paper. So you must be smart. . . . You are now director of public relations."

Heaven help us, but that's the way many so-called public relations men are chosen! And this particular college wanted to know why the *New York Times* and the other newspapers neglected the college. Why, the releases that came to my desk were so amateurish that no one could have used them and retained his professional standing.

There's the rub. Newspaper men want a professional touch. We want to deal with men and women who understand the press, who know the techniques of the newspapers, who know their limitations and weaknesses. So much of the copy that comes across my desk each week from the colleges and universities of the country is pitifully inadequate. It is poorly written, not at all in newspaper style. It has no place in a newspaper—and that is why much of the stuff we get ends up in the wastepaper basket.

Education is vitally important today. It is essential that we have a well-trained, well-educated electorate. The day of rah-rah, gold-fish-swallowing yarns is over. Colleges should stress the important, the significant, the vital news on their campuses, not the trivial, the chit-chat, the unimportant. Because education is so important for our survival, for our way of life, it is essential that it receive full public support. When the citizens of our country understand the value of education, the necessary financial backing will be forthcoming.

Public relations can help us get the support and interest of the man in the street as well as the man who controls the pocketbook. Yet sometimes I am amazed at the lack of understanding on the part of even the simplest practices in the field of press relations. A few days ago a college president came to see me. He explained that he wanted to tell me about his college, and politely wondered why I had not used any stories about his institution.

"Do you send me any releases?" I asked.

"Why, no," he answered, "but we do send you our bulletins and catalogues."

I answered politely, "I hardly think that is enough. I want your stories written so that they can be used with a minimum of research."

"Is that so?" he said somewhat incredulously. "I thought that it was your job to come to us to find out what we are doing. I am surprised to hear that you don't do that."

I explained that since I received from 900 to 1,000 releases each week from colleges all over the country, and since I could use less than 10 percent of them, I would find it rather difficult to try to interpret the significant stories in every pamphlet or bulletin that came to me.

Building good press relations is a long term project and cannot be attained overnight. I remember covering a college conference recently—an educational event that needed covering. Yet no one seemed to be in charge. The president of the organization gave no help. Although a publicity chairman had been appointed as so often happens, he was a teacher with no experience in public relations.

"Any prepared releases?" the publicity chairman was asked.

"Sorry," said he, "we have nothing at all."

"How about some information about your speakers?"

"I wish I could help you," he said in distress, "but I'm new at this stuff. I don't know why I was tossed into it."

Neither did the reporters. The upshot was that a good conference received scanty notice in the press. The organization asked me sometime later why nothing about their important sessions appeared in the press.

"Maybe if you got a good public relations man you could reach the papers," I replied simply.

My suggestion to you is this: tell the newspapers what you are doing and how you are doing it. Moreover, tell them in their own language—that is, through news releases competently written, adequately prepared, and professionally presented. A good public relations man will know these details—a college president is not supposed to. That is where public relations so often falls down when the college official tries to take over this job.

Frequently I am asked: why wasn't my story used? Why isn't it as good as some of the other pieces in your paper? Well, the answer is not too difficult. I have a formula, which I would like to present to you by which I judge the kind of stories that finally get into the education section. They include:

1. Is the story important?
2. Is it significant in the field of education?
3. Is it timely?
4. Is it interesting?
5. Is it written in newspaper style for a newspaper-audience?

My big complaint at this time is that the educational organizations as well as the colleges and universities spend

much time and money in setting up a program but then spend nothing to publicize it. Not long ago I attended a very important college conference. More than 1500 educators were present, and good speakers, too. Here was an opportunity for higher education to receive the press, and become acquainted, as well as to tell the public what was being done in the postwar world.

What happened? I attended the convention, and with naive trust, I came to the registration desk and asked for the publicity director. For the what? Oh, for the person in charge of the public relations. A half dozen simultaneous speeches were going on, many important sessions were listed—I needed help in interpreting the important doings. Besides, I had to file a daily as well as a Sunday column.

Alas, there was no one in charge of publicity. Well, I'm somewhat used to that by this time, and was not unduly surprised. It just meant that I had to work a bit harder and perhaps I would miss some of the best speeches; I would trust to luck to get what I could.

A half dozen or more of the reporters were assigned to the convention. I got to know several of them personally, we worked together. You should have heard the remarks made by those working men about the lack of co-operation. They were fit to be tied, they were so annoyed.

"What's the matter with these blankety-blank educators?" several asked me. "Why can't I get a little help? I've been chasing around all morning trying to find out what is happening and all I've got is the runaround."

In disgust the reporters got up from the session. "Let's get out of here," one of the reporters barked. "If I can't get any help, there just won't be any story. I can't waste my time covering this mess."

Is that good public relations? Unless you are willing to co-operate with the press, you will find yourselves cut off from the reporters and editors.

Higher education can be interpreted through the press in such a way that the public will understand the issues, and understanding, will support your programs. Sometimes public relations directors will have to stand up and be counted.

Recently a well known public relations man came in to see me, and told me this story:

He was preparing several releases, and the deadline was rapidly approaching. In haste, he went into the president's office to get the stories approved. While in the office two vanloads of furniture arrived, to be used for the new building program on the campus. The official in charge of the furniture came into the office:

"Mr. President," said he, "I want you to look the furniture over and give me your approval of the material."

The president went out, followed by the public relations man, jittery lest he miss his deadline. Slowly, the president and the other official studied the furniture, joking and laughing, unmindful of the public relations director standing first on one leg and then on the other. Finally the public relations expert threw discretion to the winds, and thumped:

"Now wait a minute, Mr. President. Which is more important, a vanload of furniture or our relations with the public?" The president stopped a moment and said thoughtfully: "I guess you're right. Let's go back to my office."

HIGHER EDUCATION AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

DWIGHT B. HERRICK

NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY

I KNOW of a gentleman, a teacher in a Chicago high school, a school with excellent receiving equipment, who, following V-J Day, was asked by our Educational Director in Chicago what he and his history class had thought of the V-J Day broadcasts. He answered that they had not listened to them. When asked why, he said that the subject matter did not fit into the lesson schedule for that day.

This is the most apt illustration I know of the complete failure of many educators, both in the secondary and higher educational levels, to appreciate the value of radio in education. By this I do not mean that radio alone can itself educate, but it is most certainly one of the most valuable tools of modern education, along with motion pictures, books, and publications.

Teachers and educators who fail to make use of all of the tools at their disposal, fail then in their profession.

Basically, what is education; and especially for the purposes of my remarks, where does radio fit into the educational picture? Radio can do its most successful work in the field of adult education, and I think that any broadcast which contributes to a listener's understanding of the issues he faces in his daily life, whether they are religious, social, cultural, economic, or educational, can be considered an educational program. This would include many broadcasts which the average listener, and particularly the average educator, does not in any sense of the word, consider educational. It would include many commercial broadcasts, which only because they are commercial are condemned in the eyes of many.

However, whether commercially sponsored or produced as a sustaining, the costs of which are borne by the broadcasting company, a good program which benefits the listener is a service to the listener, and it either directly or indirectly contributes to his education. Certainly the NBC Symphony concerts, or the New York Philharmonic or CBS Invitation to Music are the same, whether broadcast without an advertiser or with a commercial

plug for soap. The Bell Telephone Hour, DuPont Cavalcade, the Metropolitan Opera broadcasts, all of them used to advertise a product, are at the same time performing a great public service.

Actually a network broadcasting company is, by the nature of its organization, little more than a broker for the sale of time. The responsibility for a licensed broadcaster to perform a public service rests with the individual licensee. A network is under no obligation to broadcast any particular kind of program in any field, except insofar as the stations it may own are concerned. In the case of the National Broadcasting Company, this means that we are not required or expected to program the network with an eye to public service except for six stations we own in New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Washington, Denver and San Francisco.

However, network officials, as well as operators of independent local stations, are fully aware that they have a moral responsibility to the public regardless of any legal regulations placed upon them.

Since this is a symposium on public relations and higher education, I can be perfectly frank with you and say that most broadcasters are fully cognizant of the tremendous public relations benefits accruing to them through the more philanthropic type of broadcasts known as public service, and are selfishly interested in capitalizing on these benefits. It is important for a broadcasting company, just as it is important for a college, to create the best possible impression it can on its public. As Dr. Walters has said in his opening remarks, "Public relations represents the sum total of impressions which the American people receive of a college or university as a whole," and the same holds true for a broadcasting organization.

It is obvious that it is smart public relations for a broadcaster to schedule all types of programs on his station or network, so that he can at one time or another catch all types of audiences, ranging from the illiterate to the most highly literate.

Radio programming, on the face of it, seems to be designed for a mass audience but actually stations are programmed for various minorities, many of which have enough common interests to develop into a mass audience.

Now to the best way in which radio can be used by educators. Public relations-wise, if a college is interested in making good

impressions on radio listeners, the more often news of the college, or even its name alone is mentioned on regular broadcasts, the more the college will benefit. Merely to build one or two special programs around anniversary dates of an institution and schedule them at a time which a station network can make available is feeble public relations, because the number of listener impressions is inevitably small.

I know of many colleges and universities which have approached NBC for a fifteen-minute or half-hour period to put on a commencement address or a concert by their glee club, and have been given time, but have met with little response to the completed broadcast. On the other hand, I know of other colleges who have worked through independent advertisers, as well as the networks, to get their activities mentioned or their alma mater sung on an established broadcast, like the Fred Waring program. The results, as far as prestige and publicity for the college were concerned, have far surpassed those where more time and money had been expended to catch only a pickup audience.

In other words, colleges and universities in their efforts to promote and publicize the activities of their institution often fail, since they are more interested in the publicity that would seem to come from one broadcast than in the impressions made through more frequent mention on popular programs.

Our experience during the war proved this point beyond a shadow of a doubt. The success of various war bond drives, fat salvage campaigns, recruiting drives, etc., resulted from the fact that they were plugged on the air in short announcements on top radio shows as a constant reminder to the radio audience to support various campaigns. This same procedure is now a permanent approach by the broadcasting industry to the solution of the problem of keeping the public informed of leading issues and philanthropic campaigns.

This is the same technique that has proven commercially advantageous. It is just like saying "Chesterfield cigarettes" six times in fifteen minutes on the air. The people remember the name of the product though they almost always forget what is said about it.

I would like to touch briefly on the use of public affairs or educational broadcasts by institutions of higher learning. Programs

are not planned specifically, except in rare instances, for school use. You will find very few network broadcasts, though there are a good many local educational programs, which can be heard during classroom hours. The difficulties inherent in broadcasting programs on a network basis for in-school listening are obvious. The four time zones across the country make it almost impossible to schedule programs at a time when schools covered by the whole network can receive them.

Educational systems vary radically in different areas, states, counties, and cities, and what may be applicable to classroom use in one school is of little use in another. Above all, schools—and I speak here particularly of 'secondary schools—are not adequately equipped to receive broadcasts. In many areas there has not only been inertia on the part of educators to use radio, but there has been actual antagonism to the medium as an educational aid. Many teachers seem to fear that their chances of survival are slight in competition with the radio age. These are, of course, completely groundless and foolish fears since no broadcaster would be willing to assume the responsibilities of education, even were it possible for radio to be more than a mere supplement to direct classroom teaching.

Accordingly the vast majority of educational broadcasts can only be heard at hours when schools are not in session, so they can best be used as assigned listening in connection with the course of study, just as outside reading is assigned.

Also recordings of broadcasts can be used in the classroom, and thus fitted into the curricular plan of the individual teacher. The development of recordings for distribution to schools has been retarded, both by the war and by various restrictions placed on broadcasters by the unions working with us. Too, many schools and colleges are not equipped to make widespread use of recordings in the classroom. We in the broadcasting industry, however, fully expect that in time to come this is the answer to the vexing problem of school utilization of our products.

Colleges and universities are in a far better position financially to purchase proper equipment necessary than are the public schools which are dependent on the distribution of local taxes.

A great many colleges are exceedingly well equipped, not only with facilities for playback in the classroom, but with actual

studio and broadcasting equipment. At this particular moment there are twenty-eight standard broadcasting educational stations, the remnant remaining from over two hundred such stations in the early days of such broadcasting. These institutions, which have continued with their own broadcasting, have survived because of the quality of programs they have carried. In addition to the educational job they have done, they have over the years built tremendous good will for themselves through the activities of their broadcasting stations.

The advent of frequency modulation and television will, no doubt, result in a vast increase in the number of educational stations, and has already resulted in nineteen educational FM stations on the air. Unfortunately the public relations benefits to the institution will be in ratio to the quality of programming presented, and unfortunately also, money and talent and the know-how available to many colleges which will rush headlong into FM and television is not sufficient to keep up the high quality. So in considering establishment of broadcasting facilities these factors must be the deciding ones, in order that the history of the late 1920's and early '30's, when educational stations withered away, will not be repeated.

A mediocre, or downright poor, broadcasting service, whether educational or commercial, rather than producing good will toward the institution, will result in a dis-service to the American public.

In the past there has been a hesitancy on the part of broadcasters to take full advantage of the experience and knowledge of educators, and there has likewise been, and I think to a more marked degree, a failure on the part of educators to use the tool of radio effectively. We have each been hypercritical of the other, but in recent years we have come to realize that each can be of vast assistance to the other, and we are coming to know that understanding each other's problems and aims is the only way we can make our combined facilities work for the advantage of the American public.

PUBLIC RELATIONS THROUGH SERVICE

ARTHUR L. BRANDON
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC RELATIONS,
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE objectives of a public relations program for higher education are, to put it quite simply, to secure friends, funds and freshmen. If we have the right kind of friends, in sufficient numbers, the students and the money for the support of the college will follow in due course. It shall be my purpose, therefore, to limit my discussion to a few ways of securing and holding friends.

In an effort to enlarge the circle of friends for higher education it should be emphasized, as Dr. Walters has suggested, that not only a few individuals or groups, but all persons connected with or related to the college should be considered. The custodian of a building who is hospitable to a visitor, or the telephone operator who gives gracious service is as effective in a public relations way, on occasion, as the president who proclaims some great educational objective or the professor who develops a synthetic rubber. The alumnus who serves his community with distinction is as much of a public relations force as the trustee whose acts add to the progress of the college. A student whose behavior is noticed for its gentlemanly qualities is an asset just as is the father who advertises the high quality of education his son is receiving in your college.

In this "sum total of impressions"—which, incidentally is based on the sum total of actions and words—we all know, of course, that there is no substitute for a sound basic educational offering, nor, in the case of a university, for the related research and public service. The finer that basic work is, the more it should be known—the wider should be its reach. The kind of public relations I am thinking about is that which transmits, or transfers, some of the values of the college to ever-broadening publics. If there is something beneficial in the laboratory or library, in the classroom or cubicle for the resident students, is there not also something for the community? Only by making our wares available to more and more people can the college

effect leadership; only then can we "guide America," as we were urged to do at the opening of this symposium.

In this brief discussion I shall not dwell on the importance of student and staff or of parent and alumni relationships except as these are a part of the more general publics. I would have us remind ourselves, nevertheless, that public relations begins at home and that if these basic relationships are neglected we can accomplish little with the more remote publics.

The extension of our educational offerings is no new venture to the college. For several decades we have had off-campus programs, or special classes on the campus for non-resident students. But we have only smoothed off the surface. Even though continued education for the past decade has been the fastest growing type of education in the United States, it is a negligible part of our total work and in most small colleges is incidental to the campus teaching.

To the extent that the colleges offer some type of educational program to the people, will they be recognized as a part of the community, as an agency working for the general welfare and worthy of support.

We have long been emphasizing that a democracy requires more education than any other form of government. Yet I wonder if we have gone "all out" in seeing that education such as the college might have to offer is made available to large groups of people not regularly enrolled.

In this country today there are twice as many people who have never gone to a school of any type as there are students enrolled in all our colleges. In no state has one person in ten *completed* a four-year college course, and in most of our states not one in twenty has completed such a course. The conclusion is obvious—from a public relations point of view, which I hold should be regarded as of educational significance—we are serving a very limited public, compared to the field that is open.

Before and during the war most colleges adapted their programs so as to train several millions of older men and women in ESMWT courses. This was an effective demonstration of our ability to work with students whose experience differs from that of our regular students. If we had the ability then in mechanics and aircraft, we have it now in history and literature. In fact,

we must emphasize in our offerings the liberalizing subjects which will enable men to live more sensibly in a confusing world.

Either we must recognize our responsibility, or see some new agency established which will compete with the colleges for interest and financial support. The people will not be denied the values of continuing education.

In addition to extension or continuing education work off-campus, I wish to emphasize the on-campus program. Conferences and institutes, and other types of special events have their public relations as well as their educational values. Of course a conference should not be held just for the purpose of having a public event. It should meet a need and should be one appropriate to the sponsoring college. Likewise, any public event should be well planned far in advance and well staged and publicized.

A great deal of prestige is to be gained by such regular repeated events or special courses as the Breadloaf School at Middlebury, the Institute on Race Relations at Fisk, and the Institute of Public Affairs at Virginia; or by conferences such as the one on Postwar Problems at Vanderbilt, the UNESCO Regional Conference for which the University of Denver served as host and the Tercentenary at Harvard. Not only do these events use regular members of the faculties but they attract to the campuses many other leaders and large numbers of visiting participants. Their impact is far-reaching.

I have been talking about one way for the colleges to expand their services and by doing so, to enlarge the circle of friends—and supporters. Many ways are open to the colleges, as to the individual, to secure and hold friends. In the small college which I attended for part of my work and on whose staff I served for several years—and believe me, it was a *small* college, with an enrolment then of about 200 students—my president frequently said, “We must build up our constituency.” Though he was one of the foremost scholars it has ever been my privilege to know, he was in that early day talking about public relations.

How do we hold our friends—or build up our constituency?

By attention to them, through such courtesies as notes of congratulation, or of condolence; by recognizing them in public meetings, by giving them places of honor or referring to them in

speeches, or sending them occasional complimentary tickets; or by developing an event honoring them and presenting plaques or citations to them.

This attention may not be limited to the individual but may be centered on a group, small or large. The University of Michigan recently showed its appreciation of the contributions of the Dutch people of the State by recognizing their one hundred years of residence in Michigan through a convocation, an exhibition of Dutch paintings, a series of musical concerts, and other programs extending over a period of several weeks.

Within our own communities we make friends through our attitudes and our acts. For example, the tax exemption of college properties causes serious problems in some communities and sometimes, resentment. The colleges by being alert to such situations and by making compensating offers of aid can do much to build goodwill between town and gown.

In our search for *new* friends we ought to set up well-conceived plans of finding non-alumni who have no affiliation with any college. Frequently, as is well known, these become more interested in the college's welfare than many alumni. So often we limit membership on our important committees to our faculties and governing boards, whereas the inclusion of a new friend on a committee may prove one of the surest ways of increasing his interest and his usefulness. Many able people could and would perform effective public service for the colleges if invited to do so.

In closing, I wish to say a few words directed particularly to college presidents. You are the chief public relations officer of your institution, just as you head the faculties and other major groups or activities of the college. Long since you learned that you must have deans or a provost to handle faculty and student matters, a special officer to look after the vast business interests, an architect to plan your buildings, and lawyers to counsel you on legal problems. Perhaps you have personally retained one of these portfolios because of your special interest and experience. It may be that the portfolio that interests you most is public relations. If it is, you probably do not need an executive officer for public relations work. But you do need someone to carry out the details of a public relations program, or you will be

neglecting other important work of the presidency. That, I am confident, is a common belief of all of you.

If you are a president who recognizes the importance of public relations but you do not have the time or the technical requirements for handling the program, then obviously you need as an associate, at a high administrative level, a person who can give counsel and carry out the program which you, he, and the college wish to develop. Such a person in charge of organized public relations, should have your full support, and be regarded as a policy-making official. Furthermore, he should be given a title that will give him and his work prestige.

You have a right to expect from such a person creativeness, ingenuity, and resourcefulness. He should know and like people; he should be able to sense the public's reactions to situations and pronouncements; he should know the techniques of publicity as a tool of public relations and be able to use them effectively for the college. He should be an educator to the extent that he has a knowledge of educational trends and an appreciation for the offerings of the college and what they can mean in the life of the people if properly interpreted and extended. His task is to coordinate the many activities that reach out to the public—not, of course, to direct them all—and to work co-operatively with you and other members of the college family to the end that through education men may live together more effectively.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

GUY E. SNAVELY

FINANCES are perennial, pressing problems for college and university presidents. The great influx of students since the war worsens these problems, rather than lessens them as the uninitiated are prone to surmise. The latter fail to realize that in most colleges tuition fees do not cover much more than half the cost of educating the individual student. The colleges are really helping to a marked degree the Federal Government in its program of financing the higher education of the eligible Veterans of World War II.

In order to meet the rising costs of collegiate education, there is some tendency to appeal for Federal aid. It is axiomatic that such assistance will involve a certain amount of Federal control. Down that path inevitably lies a totalitarian type of education and of government.

If Federal aid were voted to the colleges our huge National Debt would become increasingly burdensome. It is a generally accepted theory that the rate of interest on investments must be kept down so that the Government can keep up its interest payments on this crushing obligation. To offset loss of income from endowment investments more and more member institutions are following the plan of Living Endowments, through annual gifts from alumni and other interested friends.

In the past few years a great hue and cry has been raised about the overlooking of the better high school graduate who should be going to college. It would seem that this matter has been somewhat overstressed. The admission officers of the accredited colleges can and should become more strict in keeping out the less competent students. The more capable with any ambition at all can find ways and means of enrolling in college far more readily than in any previous era.

Many philanthropic persons have established scholarship foundations. There are a large number of funds set up particularly to loan money to college students. At the present time some of these whose funds total up into the millions are not having sufficient requests to use up the monies available at the moment. The

ambitious boy or girl of the present who desires a college education should be reminded of the old adage, "Where there is a will, there is a way."

There seems to be a general consensus that for the sake of better defense and protection of the nation against possible enemies there should be established a National Science Foundation. Through such an agency there would be large appropriations of Federal Aid, not to the colleges but to the individual by way of scholarships and fellowships. It is to be devoutly hoped that the humanities and the social sciences will not be completely overlooked in the program which is finally adopted by the Congress and the President.

The world's greatest need now is the educating of competent persons to plan for a form of government and a way of life that will save mankind from utter destruction through improvements of the atomic bomb and other lethal weapons. The natural sciences can continue to receive the emphasis in the proposed Foundation with resultant improvements in the health, welfare and happiness of all citizens as well as for advances in their defense and safety.

Scholarship grants through Federal Aid really offer no help to balancing the college budget. Other than the plan of Annual Gifts remains the temptation to raise tuition fees. According to recent announcements many colleges have raised tuition rates. In these times of high wages and increased salaries, this scheme should not be decried, if the precaution is taken to increase scholarship and other assistance for the really worthy and deserving student.

Conscientious college administrators are anxious to raise salaries of the faculty, as well as of all other members of a college community. This is possible through the plans just discussed. The obvious corollary to a faculty increase of salary is the improvement of collegiate instruction.

The Association's Commission on Teacher Education has evinced real concern in this problem. As *ex-officio* member of this Commission I presented the matter at the recent annual meeting of the Association of American Universities at Iowa City on October 23-24. It is clearly evident that the Deans of our outstanding Graduate Schools are keenly interested in the edu-

cation of better college instructors. An evening program of their meeting was devoted to the subject. A favorable response was promptly given to our request that a special committee of the Association of American Universities be appointed to confer with our Commission at its next meeting, to be held in Cincinnati on the afternoon of January 12, 1948.

According to recent reports in the press a national committee, working under appointment of the U. S. Office of Education, is agitating a vigorous watering down of the High School curriculum. More than a generation ago was abolished the plan of studies that tended to prepare all high school students for admission to college. It seems rather anachronistic, or possibly a post-war hysteria, to talk about the prevailing curricula in the average high school as set up solely for would-be college students. Laying the emphasis on subjects like "budgeting, job hunting, understanding the necessity and dignity of all types of labor, and civic responsibilities" will indubitably leave the future graduate of such a curriculum far behind in the struggle for success of any sort. To many it would seem that too much time is already given to so-called "civics." Many of the topics suggested can certainly be by-products of stiffer courses in mathematics, literature and the natural sciences.

If the proposal should make any decided headway, there will of necessity be a revival on a large scale of the private preparatory school. It is axiomatic that a candidate for admission to an accredited college should give at least three fourths of his time to subjects requiring real study such as the natural sciences, algebra and geometry, foreign languages, English composition and literature, history and other social sciences, art and music.

The feeling of certain minority groups that they are maltreated when applying for admission to professional schools, particularly the medical school, can be justly shared by all kinds of persons. There are just not enough accredited medical, dental, pharmaceutical, law and engineering schools in operation to meet the present greatly increased demand. One dean of a Southern University reports this year an enrolment of 1,643 pre-medical students and a limit of 55 freshmen to be admitted to its Medical School next fall. A Northern University reports 2,400 pre-medics and a limit of 85 freshmen in its Medical School. These are just examples of a general condition.

Some possibilities for amelioration of the situation suggest themselves: (1) the medical and other professional schools can through heroic efforts expand their facilities; (2) the entrance requirements can be raised, *e.g.*, from 2 or 3 years of required college work to college graduation before admission, particularly to the medical and law schools; (3) college officers could and should tactfully advise many would-be physicians and lawyers that they would readily become more successful in some other field of endeavor. Recently published studies give clear evidence of a decided shortage in such professions as medicine, dentistry and the ministry. All approved theological schools now require the bachelor's degree before admission.

The following representatives of member institutions have served as official delegates from the Association at the ceremonies indicated, frequently as speakers on the program:

Wat Tyler Cluverius: Inauguration, President Howard B. Jefferson, Clark University, February 1.

Paul H. Musser, Margaret T. Corwin: National Conference on UNESCO, Philadelphia, March 24-26.

B. L. Parkinson: Inauguration, President R. C. Cook, Mississippi Southern College, March 28.

Gordon G. Singleton: Inauguration, President William U. Houston, Rice Institute, April 10.

Charles H. Thompson: National Education Association Conference on Teacher Selection, April 17.

Gilbert F. White, Brother G. Paul: American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, April 18-19.

John O. Gross: Inauguration, President John K. Knight, Nebraska Wesleyan University, April 24.

Clyde A. Lynch: Otterbein College Centennial, April 26.

Guy E. Snively: Inauguration, President L. M. Elstad, Gallaudet College, April 26.

W. H. Cramblet: Inauguration, President Irvin Stewart, West Virginia University, April 27.

Carey Croneis, Clarence P. McClelland: Rockford College Centennial, May 1-3.

Herbert J. Burgstahler: Inauguration, President William E. Stevenson, Oberlin College, May 3.

Bancroft Beatley, Carl S. Ell: National Citizens Conference, Boston, May 8-10.

- Carter Davidson: Inauguration, President L. O. Brown, Knox College, May 12.
- H. Gary Hudson: Inauguration, President George D. Stoddard, University of Illinois, May 16.
- G. Keith Funston: Inauguration, President Rosemary Park, Connecticut College for Women, May 17.
- Charles J. Turck: Inauguration, President Nelson V. Russell, Carroll College, May 17.
- Harry V. Masters: Inauguration, President C. Harve Geiger, North Central College, May 18.
- Philip E. Henderson: Inauguration, President E. H. Hahne, Miami University, May 19.
- Winslow S. Anderson: Inauguration, President Raymond B. Allen, University of Washington, May 24.
- George F. McDougall: Inauguration, President Fred H. Leinbach, South Dakota State College, June 2.
- Henry M. Wriston: Centennial, Lawrence College, June 6.
- Evelyn Steel Little: Inauguration, President Robert E. Burns, College of the Pacific, June 16.
- Sarah Gibson Blanding: Inauguration, President Katherine G. Blyley, Keuka College, October 4.
- Kenneth L. Heaton: Dedication of Student Center, Northeastern University, October 5.
- Eleanor M. O'Byrne: Mount St. Vincent College Centennial, October 7.
- Harry J. Carman: Inauguration, President Edward C. Fuller, Bard College, October 11.
- W. J. Jardine: Inauguration, President S. A. Watson, Friends University, October 17.
- Guy E. Snavelly: Inauguration, President Franc L. McCluer, Lindenwood College, October 23.
- Norwood Baker: Inauguration, Dean Millicent Carey McIntosh, Barnard College, October 24.
- G. W. Mead: Inauguration, President John S. Kieffer, St. John's College, October 25.
- Guy E. Snavelly: Inauguration, President Merrill J. Holmes, Illinois Wesleyan, November 1.
- Alexander Guerrey: Inauguration, President C. E. Johnson, Fisk University, November 7.
- Alexander Guerrey: Inauguration, President W. A. Groves, Centre College, November 15.

C. C. French: Inauguration, President Frank Bell Lewis, Mary Baldwin College, November 18.

H. D. Hopkins: Inauguration, President Harry C. Fox, Findlay College, November 19.

Thomas P. Govan: Inauguration, President Robert Lee Kincaid, Lincoln Memorial University, November 22.

Thomas E. Jones: Inauguration, President Samuel D. Marble, Wilmington College, November 23.

Guy E. Snavely: Inauguration, President Francis X. Talbot, Loyola College, December 3.

Thirteen letters of a general nature have gone to the membership this year.

During the year I have visited forty-six campuses of member colleges. At fourteen of them I have spoken.

As the official representative of the Association on the U. S. Commission on UNESCO I attended its annual meeting in Chicago on September 11-13. During the Second Annual Conference of UNESCO I spent three days in the City of Mexico.

To return from the arduous duties of directing the wartime organization of the WAVES, as a Captain in the U. S. Navy, to the presidency of Wellesley College at the time a movement was launched to add \$7,500,000 to the assets of the college was heavy enough a responsibility for President Horton, without assuming the presidency of our Association. However she has graciously, conscientiously and assiduously carried this additional task. She has been unfailing in her helpfulness and co-operation.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

DURING the past year the Board of Directors has held four meetings: January 15 at the Hotel Statler in Boston, April 29 and October 15 in our New York offices, and January 12 at the Netherland Plaza Hotel in Cincinnati.

Various topics discussed at these Board meetings included a National Science Foundation, a National Scholarship Program, Universal Military Training, International Association of Colleges and Universities, Proposal of the United States Congress to tax business operations of member institutions, Minority Groups in Higher Education, the National Student Association, Public Relation Programs for the Colleges, and the programs of the various Commissions of the Association—Liberal Education, International Cultural Relations, Christian Higher Education, Teacher Education, Insurance and Annuities.

The Commissions just mentioned held well attended meetings during the year, all in Washington except the meeting of the Commission on Liberal Education which was held in Princeton, New Jersey. The Commission on Christian Higher Education held two meetings and its officers met several times in addition. The group drew up important by-laws as guiding principles for the advancement of its work. These will be presented by Chairman Keppel of the Commission. Over thirty persons were investigated for the position of full time Secretary of this Commission. On the unanimous recommendation of the group the Reverend Robert N. DuBose, Director of Religious Activities at Duke University, has been appointed full time executive secretary of the Commission on Christian Higher Education. His appointment is effective January 1, 1948. Mr. DuBose received his A.B. degree from Wofford College, his B.D. Degree from Duke University and has done further postgraduate work at Union Theological Seminary. During World War II he was a Chaplain in the United States Army.

In response to a request of some months ago, the Carnegie Corporation made a grant of \$5000 for the publication of a book on *Colleges for Freedom* with President-Emeritus Donald J. Cowling of Carleton College and President Carter Davidson

of Union College as joint authors. This book has been published by Harper & Brothers. It has already received much favorable comment.

Through the courtesy of that indefatigable worker and scholarly musician, Dr. Henry S. Drinker of Philadelphia, two copies of another translation have been distributed to our member institutions. This time it is an edition of the German and English words for the solo songs and part songs for women's and men's voices of Robert Schumann, with an Introduction. Dr. Drinker has also prepared a musical index to the Schumann solo songs, which will refer to the page numbers of a complete edition of the solo songs with the music which G. Schirmer, Inc. is preparing for early publication. This index he expects to have printed and donate copies to us for similar distribution within the next few months.

The Board recommends the adoption of the following Resolutions:

WHEREAS, the Committee on Ways and Means, U. S. House of Representatives, during the course of public hearings on revision of the Internal Revenue laws, received testimony proposing drastic restriction of the tax exemption privileges of educational institutions, among others, and even an elimination of the privilege entirely;

AND WHEREAS it is in the public interest that the Federal tax exemption privilege be not curtailed but made more liberal for the following elemental reasons:

(1) From the time of the founding fathers to this day the people of this country have recognized that the survival of democracy as we know it depends upon an enlightened and informed citizenry. Our educational system operating in freedom has been and is now dedicated to the achievement of enlightenment among our people. Increasingly down through the years, fathers and mothers in every corner of our nation look forward with hope to the opportunity for the education of their children to the limit of each child's capacity. This universal desire for education is an achievement that offers the greatest hope for our future—provided our educational facilities keep pace with this desire.

(2) Our educational structure was not builded in a day. It has struggled valiantly in freedom to keep pace with the ever-increasing demands for its facilities. It was learned in the frontier days that the achievement of the education of our youth could not be accomplished by families and communities. Very early the state took upon its shoulders the burden of providing a free education through the elementary grades.

(3) The demand and hunger for higher education brought into being the colleges and universities. In the early days practically all of these were privately supported by churches and others of our citizenry who felt the absolute need for these facilities in our society. As years passed and the demand for higher education increased the state was compelled by public demand to establish institutions of higher learning.

(4) The problem and burden of financing this most essential institution in our society has always been great. Students entering the colleges and universities, both state and privately endowed, never paid and do not now pay what it costs the institution to give them an education. In the case of the state college and university the deficit is made up by state taxation and in many cases is supplemented by income from private endowment. In the case of the privately endowed institution the deficit between the charges made upon the students and the cost of the education given them has been made up by the generosity of public spirited citizens in the creation of endowment funds and in the practice of giving annually to the support and maintenance of the institution. The people and the Congress have always been very much alive to the ever-increasing problems of the financing of our educational system.

(5) The present tax exemption structure in our Federal laws is absolutely essential to the survival of our higher educational institutions, and we earnestly believe it has the approval of the American people.

In the first place, nothing would be gained by putting a tax upon the colleges and universities when it is quite obvious that the colleges and universities would have to increase the charge made upon the students; go begging for more money

from their friends or alumni; or go to the government, state, federal or both, for financial help to supply what the Federal Government would take away in taxes. Any restriction of the tax exemption pattern of today would dry up the sources of private contributions, throw greater burdens upon the state, and curtail the number of our boys and girls who could afford a college or university education.

In the second place, proceeds from activities of a college or university or from the endowment funds of a college or university are not like the profits of business enterprise, but *are in the nature of public funds only available for an essential public service*—the maintenance and support of our national purpose to educate our youth. It should be noted that in the case of private enterprise a portion only of the income in the form of taxes goes to public purposes. In the case of colleges and universities every cent of their income—if it can be called income—must go to public purposes. This principle has been recognized by the Congress. In case an individual gives all of his income to charity year after year, that individual's income is wholly exempt from Federal tax. It must not be lost sight of that all of the proceeds from activities and from endowment funds in the case of a college and university *must be devoted to a public purpose*.

(6) The Congress in recent years has had before it the sad plight of many colleges and universities unable to meet the growing demands for educational facilities. Appeals have been made for Federal aid, bills have been introduced time without number proposing Federal aid. Many of our educators and many of our citizens are prayerfully hopeful that the necessity for Federal aid can be avoided, fearing that Government control of educational processes and programs might soon follow Federal aid. Is it not wholly illogical and tragically short-sighted to add a tax burden to our colleges and universities when their whole income is already devoted to the purely public and wholly essential purpose of education, the cost of which must be met even if it eventually has to be paid out of the United States Treasury in the form of grants? It seems unanswerable that a generous tax exemption program is the safest method and the only method in harmony with our demand for, and insistence upon, a free educational system.

Every one of our colleges and universities is struggling to do an efficient and good job under the mandate of Congress to provide higher educational opportunities for the veterans. It is true that Congress has passed a law to provide for veterans' tuition. It is common knowledge that the limited sum provided only reimburses the college or university in part for the cost of the veterans' education. The deficit is an added burden on the generosity of contributors to the college or university.

Unintentionally the Government itself is responsible for the shrinking proceeds of endowment in colleges and universities because of its policy of maintaining low interest rates on account of our enormous public debt.

The rapid rise in prices has added to the burdens of these institutions.

There is crying need for the building up of larger and better-paid faculties.

There is a crying need for expansion of facilities and inadequate funds to accomplish it.

There are approximately 2,338,226 students in our colleges and universities today, of which number 48% are veterans. Approximately 1,185,849 students are enrolled in privately supported colleges and universities. Approximately 1,152,377 are in tax supported colleges and universities. Increasing millions of our youth will be knocking at the doors of our colleges and universities for higher education in the years immediately ahead.

(7) It is common knowledge that more and more is being demanded of our colleges and universities by both business and Government. It can truthfully be said that the atom bomb came from the laboratories of these institutions and the scientists manning them. This is only a striking example. There is the constantly increasing stream of help and personnel flowing from our colleges and universities into all fields of endeavor. Colleges and universities need encouragement and affirmative help to solve their growing financial problems. It would be a tragic step backwards for Government to consider curtailment of tax exemption privileges at a time when the facts and circumstances of the hour call for a broadening of the tax exemption structure in all fields as it affects colleges and universities rather than the narrowing of it.

Now, therefore, *Be it resolved*, That the Association of American Colleges, in convention assembled, opposes any curtailment of any of the Federal tax exemption provisions as they relate to educational institutions, which are now embodied in our Federal tax structure;

And *Be it further resolved*, That the Association of American Colleges petition the Congress of the United States to amend the law to permit unlimited deduction for Federal income tax purposes on account of gifts or contributions made to tax-exempt institutions of learning.

And *Be it further resolved*, That the Executive Director be instructed to furnish a copy of this Resolution to the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, and to each of the members of said Committee; to the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the U. S. Senate, and to each of the members of said Committee.

And *Be it further resolved*, that the 630 member colleges and universities of this Association be urged to give the subject matter of this Resolution their immediate and careful consideration, and that all member colleges and universities communicate their views with respect to this urgent matter to their respective United States Senators and Representatives, attaching a copy of this Resolution.

The following institutions are recommended for membership in the Association:

Barry College (Florida)
Fairmont State College (West Virginia)
Claremont College for Men (California)
Georgia School of Technology
Louisiana College
Marquette University (Wisconsin)
Midland College (Nebraska)
Mississippi Southern College
Pacific Lutheran College (Washington)
Taylor University (Indiana)
Victoria University (Canada)
University of Washington

These Chinese Colleges are recommended for associate membership:

Cheeloo University, Tsinan, Shantung
Fukien Christian University, Foochow, Fukien
Ginling College, Nanking
Hangchow Christian College, Shanghai
Hua Chung University, Wuchang
Hwa Nan College, Foochow, Fukien
Lingnan University, Canton
University of Nanking, Nanking
St. John's University, Shanghai
University of Shanghai, Shanghai
Soochow University, Shanghai
West China Union University, Chengtu
Yenching University, Peiping

and American University of Beirut, Lebanon

Several other applications for membership were laid on the table. It is again a source of gratification to note that no member institution has been dropped for nonpayment of dues.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

LEROY E. KIMBALL
VICE CHANCELLOR, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

SCHEDULE A

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

January 1, 1947 to December 31, 1947

Cash balance, January 1, 1947 \$44,955.90

Receipts

Membership dues	
Year 1946	\$ 250.00
Year 1947	45,975.00
Year 1948 in advance	225.00
Total dues	\$46,450.00
BULLETIN and Reprints	3,798.63
Music and other art books	114.67
"Comprehensive Examinations"	57.80
Interest	447.61
Contribution	25.00

Total receipts 50,893.71

\$95,849.61

Disbursements

National Commission on Christian Higher Education	\$ 9,240.00
Arts Program	6,160.00
Administrative Expenses:	
Salaries and annuities	16,809.92
Rent	1,439.00
Office expenses	1,296.48
Travel	992.57
Auditing	75.00
Committees and Commissions	2,005.82
American Council on Education	100.00
Annual meeting expenses	1,574.51
College Entrance Examination Board dues	25.00
Advances	272.73
BULLETIN and reprint expenses	5,523.53

Total disbursements 45,514.56

Cash balance, December 31, 1947 \$50,335.05

Composed of Balances in

Guaranty Trust Company of New York	\$25,778.37
Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank	8,964.83
Union Dime Savings Bank	13,946.10
Bowery Savings Bank	7,876.56
West Side Savings Bank	12,988.76
Franklin Savings Bank	7,698.76
Cash on hand	25.00

Total \$77,278.38

SCHEDULE B

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
SPECIAL PROJECTS

January 1, 1947 to December 1, 1947

Arts Program

Balance, January 1, 1947	\$25,129.27
Receipts	26,201.95
	<hr/>
Disbursements	\$51,331.22
	31,207.20
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1947	\$20,124.02

Circulating Library of Choral Music

Balance, January 1, 1947	\$ 1,664.13
Receipts	179.76
	<hr/>
Disbursements	\$ 1,843.89
	61.11
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1947	\$ 1,782.78

Commission on International Cultural Relations

Balance, January 1, 1947	\$ 1,778.75
Disbursements	454.20
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1947	\$ 1,324.55

Commission on Liberal Education

Balance, January 1, 1947	\$ 354.19
Disbursements	354.19
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1947	\$ 000.00

Cowling-Davidson Book on Liberal Education for Democracy

Balance, January 1, 1947	\$ 3,000.00
Disbursements	3,000.00
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1947	\$ 0,000.00

Guide to Comparative Literature

Balance, January 1, 1947	\$ 70.00
	<hr/>
Balance, December 31, 1947	\$ 70.00

SCHEDULE C

STATEMENT OF CASH BALANCES

December 31, 1947

Funds

General Fund	\$50,335.05
Arts Program	20,124.02
Circulating Library of Choral Music	1,782.78
Commission on International Cultural Relations	1,324.55
Guide to Comparative Literature	70.00
National Commission on Christian Higher Education	3,641.98
	<hr/>
Total	\$77,278.38

SCHEDULE D

BALANCE SHEET

December 31, 1947

Assets

Cash in Banks and on Hand	\$77,278.38
Furniture and Equipment (less depreciation)	164.60
Choral music at book value	9,300.00
Deposit with American Air Lines	425.00
Total	\$87,167.98

Funds

General Fund	\$50,760.05
Arts Program	20,288.62
Circulating Library of Choral Music	11,082.78
Commission on International Cultural Relations	1,324.55
Guide to Comparative Literature	70.00
National Commission on Christian Higher Education	3,641.98
Total (as above)	\$87,167.98

**Statement of Income and Expenditures for 1946, 1947 as
Compared with 1948 Budget**

<i>Income</i>	<i>1946</i>	<i>1947</i>	<i>Budget 1948</i>
Dues	\$30,705.25	\$46,450.00	\$46,500.00
BULLETIN and Reprints	3,379.68	3,798.63	3,000.00
Comprehensive Examinations	29.95	57.80	10.00
Music and other Art Books	95.13	114.67	10.00
Miscellaneous: Interest	414.71	761.37	400.00
Other	505.00	25.00
Total	\$35,129.72	\$51,207.47	\$49,920.00
<i>Expenditures</i>			
Annual Meeting	884.94	1,574.51	1,500.00
Membership Fees	100.00	125.00	125.00
Committees and Commissions	1,932.97	2,005.82	2,000.00
BULLETIN and Reprints	4,502.61	5,523.53	5,500.00
Regional Conferences	800.00
Rent	1,463.00	2,639.00	3,600.00
Office Expense	1,523.48	2,591.18	2,500.00
Office Equipment	1,000.00
Auditing	75.00	150.00	150.00
Travel	1,479.85	3,432.86	3,500.00
Salaries and Annuities	16,273.07	27,105.92	31,900.00
Printing	1,548.32	2,000.00
Contingencies	200.00
Advances	272.73
Total	\$28,324.92	\$46,968.87	\$54,775.00
Balance on Current Operations	\$ 6,804.80	\$ 4,238.60
Deficit on Current Operations transferred from Reserves	<u>\$ 4,855.00</u>

Report of the Treasurer

139

(For the year 1947, the figures include the Arts Program and Commission on Christian Higher Education.)

Tait, Weller & Baker
Certified Public Accountants
Philadelphia—New York

We certify that in our opinion the foregoing statements of Cash Receipts and Disbursements for the year ended December 31, 1947, of the
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
properly present the transactions for the year as recorded on the books and records of the Association.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) TAIT, WELLER & BAKER

Certified Public Accountants

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

R. H. FITZGERALD

CHANCELLOR, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

AS A RESULT of increase in membership dues, slightly higher commission from fees or honoraria, and a service charge for each visit arranged in non-member colleges, the Arts Program is well on its way toward being self-sustaining and a permanent function of the Association of American Colleges. Anticipated income for the academic year 1947-48 is within a thousand dollars of the overhead expenses. The deficit will be met from a small surplus accumulated over a period of ten years.

Eleven concert artists, one string quartet and 31 faculty visitors were announced in the printed booklet mailed April 10. The experiment of offering visitors for the summer session was not successful and it is doubtful if this offering will be continued.

The Cultural Division of the French Embassy requested our office to arrange a tour for Gaston Berger, distinguished professor of philosophy of the University of Aix (France), during the month of October. Twenty visits were arranged at the expense of the French Government.

President J. E. Walters of Alfred University, a member of the Commission on the Arts, is responsible for a plan worked out with the Grand Central Art Galleries whereby member colleges may obtain color reproductions at a discount of 50% from publishers' list price. Although the reproductions may be used for class instruction, the Commission hopes the students' appreciation of good paintings may be increased through an exhibit, purchased by colleges, open to all students and that eventually the pictures will be put on a rental basis which will encourage the use of these pictures in dormitory rooms.

A list of concert artists and faculty visitors is attached.

FACULTY VISITORS OFFERED FOR 1947-48

Visitor	Subject
Mario Bacchelli	Fine Arts (Painting)
Anton J. Carlson, University of Chicago	Chemistry
Anne Cooke, Howard University	Drama

Chester A. Darling, Allegheny College	Bacteriology
Edward Davison, Washington and Jefferson College	Creative Writing
Lamar Dodd, University of Georgia	Fine Arts (Painting)
Gabriel Fenyves, Macalester College	Piano Programs
Elsie and H. Louis Freund, Hendrix College	Fine Arts (Painting)
Edwin Gerschefski, Converse College	Piano Programs
Harry Gottlieb, New York City	Fine Arts (silk screen)
Arnold D. Graeffe, Stephens College	Aesthetics
Hugh Hodgson, University of Georgia	Piano Programs
Alexander Kerensky	International Affairs
Joseph Knitzer, Cleveland Institute of Music	Music (Violin)
Jacob Kwalwasser, Syracuse University	Music Education
J. Joseph Lynch, S. J., Fordham University	Seismology
Doris Eaton Mason	Sculpture
Arthur P. Moor, Olivet College	Oriental Civilization
William S. Newman, University of North Carolina	Music (Piano)
Lionel Nowak, Syracuse University	Piano Programs
Edwin Peterson, University of Pittsburgh	Creative Writing
Doel Reed, Colorado A. and M. College	Fine Arts (Painting and Aquatints)
Grant Reynard	Fine Arts (Painting)
Lloyd Reynolds, Reed College	Book and Print-Making
May Sarton	Fine Arts (Painting)
George Rickey, Muhlenberg College	Creative Writing
George Savage, University of Washington	Drama
Carleton Sprague Smith, New York Public Library	History and Musicology
Howard Thomas, University of Georgia	Fine Arts (Painting)
A. Curtis Wilgus, George Washington University	Latin American History
Ulfert Wilke, Springfield Art Association	Fine Arts (Painting)

CONCERT ARTISTS OFFERED ON REGIONAL TOURS, 1947-48

Visitor	Subject
Katherine Bacon	Piano Programs
The Bennington String Quartet	Two violins, viola and violoncello
Rafael de Silva	Piano Programs
Samuel Dushkin	Violin Programs
Maurice Eisenberg	Violoncello Programs
John Kirkpatrick	Piano Programs
Maria Maximovitch	Voice (Soprano)
Nancy Ness	Voice (Soprano)
Raul Spivak	Piano Programs (South America)
Yves Tinayre	Voice (Baritone)
Carl Weinrich	Organ Programs
Ernst Wolff	Voice (Tenor)

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES

MARK H. INGRAHAM

DEAN, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

LAST year this Committee, in its annual report, indicated that a careful study of various phases of the welfare and security provisions for the academic profession should be made.

About five years ago, a conference was held between your Committee and representatives of the American Association of University Professors. This was a meeting of unusual interest and it was assumed that it would be followed promptly by other similar conferences. The hyper-activity that was forced on all of us by the war explains why this was not the case. However, last November the Committee met with officers of the AAUP and it was agreed that the two associations should co-operate in a two-fold program:

1. To carry out a fact-finding study of such matters as retirement plans, group insurance, hospitalization and disability insurance, provisions for sick leave, unemployment insurance and the cost and effect of extending to the colleges various provisions of the Federal Social Security program.

2. To hold a series of conferences between representatives of the two associations for the purpose of formulating a statement of principles concerning acceptable practices regarding retirement, insurance and related welfare provisions in colleges and universities. This statement might play a role akin to that played by the 1940 statement concerning academic freedom and tenure.

This Committee believes that funds can be secured to make this study possible. It is delighted to report that Rainard B. Robbins, the man best fitted to direct this fact-finding study, has agreed to do so. An advisory committee of the two associations has been appointed to assist Mr. Robbins. The members of this Association are urged to cooperate by furnishing information for this study when it is requested.

The second portion of the program will in general await at least the preliminary findings arising from the first portion.

During the year a citizens advisory council has been appointed by the Senate Finance Committee to consider extension of the Social Security System. The chairman of this council is Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., and Professor Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard University has been named associate chairman. Your Committee is keeping in touch with this council which, until now, has devoted its attention chiefly to the Old Age and Survivorship aspects of the system rather than to unemployment insurance.

The Committee believes that the problems which last year were urged upon your attention, have become more rather than less pressing during the ensuing twelve months, and it recommends that the members of this Association give these problems their careful consideration.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LIBERAL EDUCATION

GORDON KEITH CHALMERS

PRESIDENT, KENYON COLLEGE

YOUR Commission on Liberal Education, having examined volume one of the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, wishes to make the following observations:

1. It applauds the desire of the President's Commission to extend to all Americans the opportunity for higher education. Such a desire is wholly in the tradition of American colleges of liberal arts, which have always—at least in most parts of the country—sought out and educated poor boys and girls, despite the limitations of very meagre resources.

2. Colleges of liberal arts have always required of their students a more than average capacity for accurate observation and clear thought. And they have assumed that those capacities are developed only by extended discipline. They have learned by experience that not all persons are capable of developing them in a high degree. The subject of liberal education is man, thinking and in action; its object is the development of understanding, the cultivation of insight, and the guidance of action. Your commission is therefore disturbed by the assertion of the President's Commission that such education is "aristocratic" in method and intention, and by the implications of its declaration that the "matter and method" of liberal education should be *shifted* "to the service of democracy." By denying, as it seems to do, "the importance of verbal skills and intellectual interests"; by saying that subject matter should be "at the periphery" of education, not the center, and that study should "emphasize generalizations" rather than the disciplinary process by which generalizations are formed—all these assertions of the President's Commission seem to us unrealistic. For these assertions seem to be based upon the assumption that there are no degrees of ability, and that efforts to establish such degrees are undemocratic. The first volume of the Report of the President's Commission seems to your commission to contain ambiguities and misconceptions about liberal education which it is important to correct.

3. Your commission is distressed by the assertion of the Presi-

dent's Commission that the academic selection of students is undemocratic. We believe, on the contrary, that a non-selective program would be undemocratic. In our opinion, a student has the right to as good an education as he can be given and as he is capable of receiving; anything less than that is not only undemocratic but dangerous to the whole concept of higher education and intelligent citizenship.

Your commission doubts the validity of the following statement in the Report—that all students who rank in the 7th percentile of the ACE Psychological Examination have a “reasonable expectation” of successfully completing the 14th year in the proposed program of community colleges—unless, of course, higher education is hereafter to be equated with abilities of the least able. It equally doubts the statement that all students who rank in the 21st percentile are capable of graduating from college, at least as it understands the word “college.” Careful academic selection of students, your commission believes, is essential to the maintenance and improvement of the quality of higher education.

4. The extent to which your commission agrees with the detailed proposals of the President's Commission can be determined only when it has had an opportunity to examine the forthcoming volumes of that Commission's Report. But a consideration of the first volume impels your commission to say that reiterated statements in that volume, and recurrent overtones, not only betray a basic confusion upon what constitutes general and what liberal education, but will be misinterpreted as an attack upon liberal education as such.

NOTE: After the above material had gone through the page proof a wire has been received from Dean T. R. McConnell of the University of Minnesota, a member of the Commission, making the request to “Please publish my name as dissenting.”

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION

WILLIAM W. WHITEHOUSE

PRESIDENT, ALBION COLLEGE

THIS Commission has felt justified in asserting that "the liberal arts colleges have both a professional and an ethical obligation to be deeply conscious of the marked crisis in teaching and to accept our responsibility as strategic agents in meeting the needs of the day. Our role in American education has been a historic one and it still has a distinct and vital contribution to make in the great task of preparing teachers for the nation's schools and colleges." Because of this declaration of principles we share with many others interested in teacher education appreciation of the progress made during the year in the aroused interest, everywhere apparent, of the quantitative and qualitative problems in the field of education. In no similar period has the nation become more aware of the threat of a shortage of trained teachers and the necessity of resources large enough to make possible a continuous supply of well-trained people to man the important positions in all types of schools. Throughout the year, the Commission has co-operated with other professional agencies in participating in programs organized to study the needs and methods of producing better teachers. We are greatly indebted for the many courtesies extended by kindred associations, making possible our sharing in the creative thinking of these various groups. Once again we can report confidently as to the advantage of holding membership in the National Council on Cooperation in Teacher Education. This makes it possible for our Association to share mutually in the programs and findings of this Council. It also gives us the opportunity of presenting our point of view and our specific program in the field of teacher education.

A meeting of the Commission was held in Washington on October 21, 1947. In addition to the members of the Commission, we were privileged to have the counsel of Dr. Guy E. Snavelly, Executive Director of the Association, and Dr. Karl W. Bigelow of Columbia University, who graciously gave his services for the meeting.

The last report of the Commission was reviewed and progress was reported on some of the objectives set forth. For some time there has been expressed the urgent need of a conference between representatives of the Association and the Association of American Universities to discuss the important problem of the preparation of teachers for undergraduate colleges and secondary schools. Dr. Snively was instrumental in effecting a preliminary conference, and on October 24 the Executive Director and two other representatives of the Commission met the Deans of the A.A.U. at Iowa City. They arranged to appoint a committee to confer with our representatives: Deans Payne of Indiana University, Thomson of McGill University, Gilbert of University of Rochester, Richardson of Brown University, Tebbutt of Northwestern University, Blegen of University of Minnesota, Bunker of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Wild of Harvard University. It is reported that the A.A.U. will set up a permanent committee for this reciprocal task. We are assured that the A.A.U. has given serious thought to the question of teacher training and many of the member institutions are discussing new programs designed to take into account the teaching aspect of graduate training.

Dean P. S. Wild of Harvard, president of the A.A.U., delegated Dean Paul Hudson of Ohio State University to confer with our Commission during this conference session. Arrangements are being made for a meeting in the spring between representatives of these two associations. Our Commission is extending an invitation to the representatives of the American Association of Teachers Colleges and the American Association of Junior Colleges to meet with us at that time.

Considerable time has been given to the possibility of exploring the status of teacher education as it now exists in the member institutions. No extensive picture has been obtained within the last decade as to the overall teacher education program in the liberal arts colleges comprising the membership of the Association. Your Commission is greatly in need of more information as to various factors, attitudes and trends in the field of teacher education. This deficiency in data leads us to make a definite effort to explore this activity as it relates to the member institutions. Dr. Karl W. Bigelow of Teachers College is assisting in

providing help in this task from a graduate of one of our liberal arts colleges, now completing his doctor's degree work at Columbia University.

In the report published by the American Council on Education in 1944, "Teachers For Our Times," this need of more information is considerably stressed and with it some questions as to the status of teacher education in the liberal arts colleges. (See pp. 14-15 of the report.)

The members of the Commission are rightfully seeking answers to many questions covering their tasks, such as:

What are the trends of teacher preparation in our types of colleges over the last decade?

Has the quality of prospective teachers improved or deteriorated?

How do they compare in grade level and general personality acceptability with students majoring in other fields?

What particular interest do our member institutions have in the teacher education-planning going on in their particular states?

What degree of participation exists in the liberal arts colleges? In some instances it has been reported to be inadequate. To what extent is this true?

If a college has engaged in the teacher education program, why has it done so? In what ways does this assignment have a definite place in the institutional objectives?

Undoubtedly, some of our member institutions do not engage in the training program. What are the reasons?

What are the feelings of the liberal arts college as to its fitness and desirability as a teacher-preparing institution? What gives it a vantage point in excellency, if such is believed to be the case?

With the apparent class consciousness of elementary teaching, supported by the single salary system, will the liberal arts college feel the necessity and ability to prepare teachers for this level, as well as for the secondary? In what ways, if any, does the preparation of elementary teachers disrupt the curriculum of the typical liberal arts college? What changes in teaching standards are thought advisable?

In the light of rising standards of requirements for a teacher's certificate, say, to the master's degree level, what approval will the liberal arts college give to this apparent development?

What prevailing criteria are in operation to secure a wise selection of the students who engage upon a teacher training program?

It has been stressed by this Commission that teacher education work should have every privilege and status afforded to other programs in the liberal arts college. Information, if procurable, might be very enlightening as to the attitude of the entire faculty towards this task. Is it a "vocational migrant," or is it an accepted liberalizing program?

What appraisals and new developments are evident in the teacher education program? What evaluation is made of it and what are the sources called upon to make the evaluation objective?

What significant changes and experiments have been introduced in the last few years to improve or extend the teacher training program in our colleges?

This information would be exceedingly interesting to our colleges and would certainly be valuable as an index for further undertakings by the Commission.

We would like to acknowledge our appreciation of the services and counsel extended to us by the Executive Director, Doctor Snively.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MINORITY GROUPS In Higher Education

WILLIAM P. TOLLEY

CHANCELLOR, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

THE committee which brings this report represents an association of liberal arts colleges. Quite properly therefore, we have addressed ourselves to the problem of minority groups in undergraduate colleges. We are leaving to other associations the problem of the professional schools.

We present the report with a sense of deep concern, shame and humility. We are dealing with the ugly side of American higher education. We are not proud of our treatment of minority groups. We have a troubled conscience. Unlike the Nazis, we have no blood on our hands, but nevertheless our hands are not clean. We have much to regret, much to protest against, much to change and correct.

The report might easily be even stronger. Most of us who had a part in preparing it would personally favor the strongest statement we could draft. We are dealing with evil and we should like to destroy it. But we are mindful that realism is needed as well as the vision splendid. We must have patience as well as courage.

If by reason of geography a college has no minority problem, it is easy for it to criticize southern colleges on the charge of segregation and inequality of instruction for Negro students, and eastern colleges for discrimination against Jews. Its criticism is meaningless if it has relatively few Negroes and Jews on its faculty and representatives of minority groups in its student body.

Some college presidents have indicated that the problem is somewhat remote to their experience. For most of us, however, both the problem and the threat of unwise legislation are very real.

It is not a simple problem. Moreover it is not a problem that one college, standing alone, can solve. Even an attack on a state or regional basis is not enough. The colleges of the North can do much to help solve the Negro problem by the admission of Negro students and the appointment of Negroes as faculty

members. The southern and western colleges can help the eastern institutions by admitting Jewish students and appointing Jews as members of the faculty. What is required is a national attack on the problem.

We do not oppose legislation outlawing discrimination in public schools and tax supported colleges. We oppose legislation which gives a politician power to blackmail and bludgeon independent colleges out of existence. The independent college is the very fountain of freedom in American life. It stands between the politician and the newspaper, the politician and the church, the politician and the public school, the politician and the state university.

We do not say that the independent college is without sin. We are more conscious of its shortcomings than any other group. But we know that whether it makes mistakes or not, it must be kept free. Grant the state power over it, and it will be but a short step to state control of denominational and sectarian schools.

Human freedom is the goal of American democracy. We must confess, this has not been reached. But it will never be reached if we permit all education to be held in the iron grip of the state. In asking for legislation granting the state power of life and death over the independent college, we invite the destruction of all our freedom. If these wells be poisoned we shall all die of thirst.

May I speak personally for a moment. I happen to be one who rejoiced in the position taken on this question by the President's Commission on Higher Education. But I noted that there was a strong minority report.

We have prepared a report which will undoubtedly be attacked from both sides. We have no pride of authorship and no objection to minor amendments. We should like to stand firm, however, on two points: the establishment of the new commission, and our unalterable opposition to legislation affecting either independent or church-related colleges.

When the discussion comes to a close we trust these two points will be sustained and that there will be no minority report. It is our hope that American higher education will speak with a united voice.

MINORITY GROUPS IN THE COLLEGES

In its dual system of private and tax-supported institutions of higher learning, the United States has developed an educational program unmatched anywhere in the world. In few other countries is there a like degree of academic freedom. Nowhere are the doors of educational opportunity opened so wide to youth both rich and poor. Nowhere are so many youth in attendance at colleges.

American institutions of learning, moreover, have achieved their ends through an organization uniquely their own. Although the Liberal Arts College owes much to British influence, in its present form it is as American as corn pone and baseball. Our universities were fashioned after Germanic models, but our undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences has no exact counterpart elsewhere. Its development was largely the work of religious denominations. Most of our colleges were founded by churches or churchmen concerned with the need for Christian education. The growth of tax-supported colleges is a more recent development on the American scene. Even now an overwhelming majority of the colleges listed in the membership of the Association of American Colleges were established under religious auspices.

Since the turn of the century many denominational colleges have reorganized their Boards of Trustees and have become independent of church control. Even in these institutions, however, a proud tradition of religious influence is still preserved in the recruitment of students, the church affiliations of presidents and faculties, and the conduct of the campus religious program. There are, moreover, many American colleges without specific denominational connection that were founded by devout churchmen to serve the cause of Christian education. There are colleges by the score that while free from denominational control, still cherish their Christian emphasis in instruction and campus life.

Nor is it surprising that the character of college populations is affected by regional differences. The minority problems of the South and Southwest are quite different from those of the East and the Middle West.

Nevertheless the fact that our American colleges have their roots in the soil of religion means that they are expected to provide moral as well as intellectual leadership. Thus the unfinished business of democracy is their special responsibility. If the lessons of freedom, justice and human brotherhood are to be learned, they must be taught in our colleges. If the tensions between races and creeds are to be lessened they should first be reduced on the campus. If the problem of national unity is to be solved, it must first be solved in our institutions of learning.

Colleges should lead, not follow the thinking of society. Perhaps more than any other agency they have the power to shape the future of American culture. At a time when the eyes of the world are upon us and when the ideals of democracy are under severe and continuous attack, higher education in America has an unparalleled opportunity for leadership.

More and more attention is being called to the fact that many colleges discriminate against minority racial and religious groups. In several states legislation has been introduced which threatens the tax-exempt status of non-sectarian colleges found guilty of racial or religious discrimination in the admission of students. Thus far no legislation of this kind has been passed, but there is abundant evidence that it is attracting increasing public support.

With the motives of the groups supporting such legislation the members of your committee are in hearty accord. It is our conviction, however, that the problem of discrimination should be solved by education and voluntary action and not by coercive legislation. However well intentioned such legislation may be, it would place in the hands of the state a threat to the freedom of colleges now independent of political control. That independence is an effective safeguard of academic freedom in both tax-supported and privately-endowed institutions of higher learning. It is among our strongest defenses against the misuse of political control of our public schools. It is a powerful weapon protecting American democracy from the peril of state or national dictatorship. We are therefore opposed to any infringement of the freedom of the independent college.

We are confident, moreover, that greater progress can be made through voluntary action and education than by the enactment of legislation. We believe that the most practicable approach to

the problem is the appointment under the auspices of the Association of American Colleges of a national commission to which instances of discriminatory policies can be referred and which will have authority to investigate and establish the facts as accurately as possible. The commission should report annually to the association.

The colleges and universities of America are fully conscious of their responsibility for the building of a democratic society. They are therefore deeply concerned about reducing prejudices and opening doors of educational opportunity for all American youth. In the past decade, progress in eliminating the barriers to students on the grounds of race or religion has been significant indeed. There is general agreement that we should work toward their total elimination. As we look to the future we want no underprivileged citizens, no handicapped citizens, no second-class citizens.

It is the judgment of the Commission that colleges and universities will never be able to avert legislation requiring greater opportunities for minority groups by defending discriminatory practices or by talking in terms of token representation. These groups unquestionably wish to be considered as Americans, entitled to all the opportunities—including educational opportunities—open to others in this country. They certainly do not wish to be regarded as outside groups from which colleges can take extremely limited numbers. They object to requirements for admission that are not openly acknowledged and that are used as a cloak for discrimination in procedures.

Nevertheless it is unrealistic and unfair to expect colleges of all kinds and in all sections of the country to pursue identical admission policies. Many large urban universities have in recent years been innocent of anything approaching discriminatory practices in the admission of students. They have even removed from their application blanks for admission to the undergraduate and the professional schools questions concerning race, nationality, and color. They have done this not because the questions were not proper questions to ask, but because in the light of careless and unproved charges of discrimination their presence on the blanks might be misunderstood.

It is wholly natural that institutions should endeavor to pre-

serve the traditions established by their founders and the essential character of their student bodies. However, all institutions, of whatever origin or tradition, should enrol as students persons of many different religions, racial and national backgrounds if they are to promote that spirit of mutual respect and confidence which has become increasingly essential in these days when group tensions threaten the welfare of society.

Through the national commission whose appointment is recommended by your committee, there should be an active program among all colleges to broaden educational opportunity to qualified youth regardless of race, religion or national origin. This objective can be accomplished only through the co-operation of colleges and universities of all types throughout the country.

In carrying out this objective, however, due consideration should be paid to the individual character, purpose, and commitments of each institution. The strength of American higher education comes in great part from two cardinal American virtues: freedom and diversity. We shall not solve the problem of education for minority groups if the solution violates either of these two principles. External pressure or coercive legislation upon this or that particular region will only serve to slow down the general improvement in American educational opportunity. By collective consideration and action the colleges and universities themselves can work toward an eventual disappearance of the minorities problem so far as it concerns higher education in America.

In light of the foregoing observations it is evident that the proposed commission can formulate concrete and positive suggestions which in the long run should help to ameliorate the situation under consideration.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

LEONARD CARMICHAEL

PRESIDENT, TUFTS COLLEGE

Be It Resolved by this Association of American Colleges in annual meeting assembled that:

This Association reaffirms its historic policy of favoring the promotion of all wise means which lead to the equalizing of educational opportunity for all deserving American students.

Be It Further Resolved that:

Since such equalization of educational opportunity is in part dependent on economic factors, the Association continue to recognize and encourage all appropriate means of financing higher education, such as: student fees, gifts from private donors, from industry, educational and philanthropic foundations, religious groups and direct and indirect subventions from local, state and federal governments.

Be It Further Resolved that:

Since it is recognized that various programs for modifying the nature of federal aid to education are now under active consideration, the Association specifically instructs its officers to support actively such of these programs as seem to be in the best interest of higher education. In deciding which of such proposed programs to support the Association urges that especial care be exercised to favor only those programs in which the full freedom of higher education from any form of undesirable governmental interference is fully safeguarded. The Association further advises its officers to favor plans in which institutions which are at present largely publicly supported and those which are largely non-publicly supported, including colleges which are Church related, shall alike share in such federal assistance. In this connection the Association emphatically recommends that a broad and properly conceived and administered program of

national scholarships shall be favored in principle, subject to the safeguards mentioned above.

Be It Further Resolved that:

The Association instructs its officers to support all proper legislation looking to the establishment of a National Science Foundation. In supporting such legislation the programs shall be favored which provide that the Federal Government shall secure its investigatory work, in part at least, by contracts with educational institutions. It is the wish of the association that this legislation shall provide that such contracts be made by the government so as to secure for all legitimate national needs the most effective possible scientific and other research. This is interpreted to mean that the association does not favor legislation requiring that all or any part of such contracts must be made with any one type of institution such as the Land Grant Colleges, non-publicly supported universities or Liberal Arts Colleges. It urges that while contracts shall be made primarily for the purpose of providing the most effective and economical investigatory work for the government, nevertheless the importance of using such contracts as a means of developing new research centers and new research personnel shall be emphasized.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF ACADEMIC DEANS

RUTH L. HIGGINS
DEAN, BEAVER COLLEGE

THE fourth annual meeting of the American Conference of Academic Deans, affiliated with the Association of American Colleges, was held in the Netherland Plaza Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio, January 12, 1948. The fact that over three hundred deans registered and attended the all-day session showed the rapidly growing interest in the informal organization devoted to problems and trends of particular concern to academic deans.

After the opening invocation given by Reverend Stephen A. Mulcahy, Dean of Boston College, Dr. Clement C. French, Dean of Randolph-Macon Woman's College and Chairman of the Conference, announced that two professors and an art museum director would have an opportunity to challenge the deans on the subject, "The Place of the Creative Arts in Liberal Education." Professor R. D. Welch, Princeton University, in discussing "The Study of Music as a Humanistic Discipline" pointed out that any art which is alive cannot exist without the practice of it but that only the gifted deserve academic credit for it. He also made the observation that in addition to knowing the history and theory of music, most persons need to be taught to hear. Professor Cleanth Brooks, Yale University, speaking on "The Place of Creative Writing in the Study of Literature," explained that the problems of reading and writing interpenetrate each other and that the teacher of creative writing must also teach creative reading, since he is dealing with literature as a craft. The third topic, "The Fine Arts in Liberal Education," was presented by Mr. Philip Phys Adams, Director, The Cincinnati Art Museum, who brought out the idea that the true artist's studio is a place for study as well as for performance. He indicated that a minimum of a year should be spent in the studio. The speakers on the panel were besieged with questions by the deans, before the adjournment for the informal luncheon in the Hall of Mirrors.

The first part of the afternoon program was concerned with

"The Effect of Federal Aid to Education on the Future of Private Colleges and Universities." Dean M. M. White, University of Kentucky, expressed the opinion that federal aid would not be detrimental and that because of it the quality of the faculty would be improved and opportunities for students would be equalized. Frank E. Baily, Kenyon College, summarized three methods of federal aid: (1) subsidies granted directly to the college, (2) aid administered through the states, (3) national scholarships to be given to the students who would have the privilege of choosing their colleges and he emphasized the desirability of the third method.

The question "Should There Be any Difference in the Liberal Arts Education of Men and Women?" was discussed by Dean Evelyn C. Rusk, Wells College, and Dean Harlan Hatcher, Ohio State University. Dean Rusk believed that "education in the liberal arts for men and women at the college level should not differ in any fundamental fashion, but in such secondary phases as emphases, choice of offerings, and the immediate or terminal values sought." Dean Hatcher also agreed that there should be little difference in the liberal arts education of men and women. He objected to the learning of cooking and baby care in college courses, but he advocated the inclusion of child development and psychology for both men and women. In accordance with the traditional practice, discussion periods followed both groups of papers.

Dean Martin ten Hoor, University of Alabama, the outgoing Vice-Chairman, was elected as Chairman, and Dean Harlan Hatcher as Vice-Chairman for 1948. Dean Elizabeth May, Hood College, will continue as Secretary-Treasurer, and Dean Ruth L. Higgins, Beaver College, will serve another year as Editor of the *Proceedings*. Dean Frank Kille, Carleton College, was chosen to serve on the Executive Committee with Dean Stephen A. Mulcahy, Boston College, Dean Logan Wilson, Tulane University, Dean Margaret Morriss, Pembroke College in Brown University, and Dean C. Clement French, Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

THE OFFICIAL RECORDS
Minutes of the 34th Annual Meeting of the
Association of American Colleges

JANUARY 12-14, 1948
HOTEL NETHERLAND PLAZA
CINCINNATI, OHIO

NOTE: The Addresses and Commission Reports are to be found in this issue of the BULLETIN.

First Session

THE thirty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges was called to order at 8:00 P.M. by the President, Mildred McAfee Horton, president of Wellesley College. Prayer was offered by President David D. Jones, Bennett College.

President Horton announced the appointment of the following committees:

Committee on Nominations

President Charles J. Turck, Macalester College, *Chairman*
Chancellor R. H. Fitzgerald, University of Pittsburgh
President Daniel L. Marsh, Boston University
President Florence M. Read, Spelman College
President C. J. Steiner, Jr., Xavier University

Committee on Resolutions

President David D. Henry, Wayne University, *Chairman*
M. Thomas Aquinas, College of New Rochelle
President J. M. Ellison, Virginia Union University
President J. H. Grier, Monmouth College
President G. Herbert Smith, Willamette University

At the request of President Horton, the Executive Director presented new college presidents who were in attendance at the meeting.

Two admirable addresses on the theme of the Annual Meeting, "The Colleges for Freedom," were delivered by Bishop John K. Mussio of Steubenville, Ohio, and The Reverend Doctor Ralph W. Sockman, Christ Methodist Church, New York City.

Second Session

The Tuesday morning session was opened at 9:30 A.M. by President Horton. The first order of business was the report

of Treasurer LeRoy E. Kimball, who presented the auditor's statement for the financial operations of the current year. He presented with some detailed explanations the proposed budget for 1948 which had already been discussed and approved by the Board of Directors. On motion, the report was approved and the budget adopted, with authority given to the Board to make necessary changes.

The Executive Director read his report with pertinent observations and some details of the year's work. He then read the report of the Board of Directors which included recommendations concerning some resolutions on tax exemptions for institutions of higher education and for the election of eleven new institutions to membership in the Association. Both reports are published on preceding pages.

On motion, it was voted to elect to membership the institutions approved by the Board.

After it was moved and seconded that the resolutions concerning tax exemptions be approved, considerable eloquent discussion evolved, participated in by President Morgan S. Odell of Lewis and Clark College, Father Edward Rooney of the Jesuit Educational Association, President Mordecai W. Johnson of Howard University, President Edward A. Fitzpatrick of Mount Mary College, President Daniel L. Marsh of Boston University, President Benjamin E. Mays of Morehouse College, President Gordon K. Chalmers of Kenyon College, President Paul D. Eddy of Adelphi College and President Lynn T. White of Mills College.

The motion of President Chalmers to defer action until the next day was defeated.

The following amendment was offered by President Mordecai Johnson, seconded by President Mays:

Except that it is our judgment that the State and Federal Governments should make use of the power to withdraw tax exemption from institutions which exclude citizens from the enjoyment of their services, on account of race, color, religion or national origin.

After further discussion, this amendment was lost, whereupon the question was called for and the resolutions adopted.

President Joseph W. Barker of the Research Corporation,

presented a statement concerning the activities of the Corporation, which would interest the member institutions, particularly the smaller colleges.

The rest of the forenoon was devoted to the discussion on Universal Military Training. President Harold W. Dodds of Princeton University delivered an address in favor, and President Alexander Guerry of the University of the South gave an address in opposition, both of which are published in this issue of the BULLETIN.

It was moved by President Charles J. Turck of Macalester College that the recommendations contained in the Guerry address be adopted by the Association. This motion was discussed somewhat vigorously by the following: Dean Herbert P. Woodward of Rutgers University, Dean Norman N. Royall of Kansas City University, President Benjamin Mays of Morehouse College, Father Edward Rooney of the Jesuit Educational Association, President David Lockmiller of the University of Chattanooga, President Harold W. Dodds of Princeton University, President Alexander Guerry of the University of the South, President Clyde E. Wildman of De Pauw University, President Dale D. Welch of Alma College, Dean Lloyd C. Emmons of Michigan State College, President Daniel L. Marsh of Boston University.

On motion of President Samuel D. Marble of Wilmington College, it was voted to divide the Turck resolution for adoption of the Guerry recommendations into two divisions and to vote on them separately. The vote on the first recommendation, which is for "this Association to go on record as opposed to compulsory Universal Military Training" was carried by a vote of 219 to 69.

The second part of the Guerry recommendations—the seven items found on page 66 was approved *viva voce*, with one person voicing a negative attitude.

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Chairman Turck presented the proposed list of officers and commission members for the year 1948. On motion, the officers and commission members whose names are printed in the front pages of this issue of the BULLETIN were elected.

After brief announcements the morning session adjourned for luncheon about 12:30 P.M.

Third Session

President Horton called the delegates to order at 2:30 P.M., sharp.

The first order of business was a symposium on "The American College and UNESCO." Interesting addresses were delivered by President Laurence Duggan of the Institute of International Education, President Francis S. Hutchins of Berea College, and Director Ben M. Cherrington of the Social Science Foundation of the University of Denver.

Upon conclusion of these formal statements, to be found elsewhere in the BULLETIN, there ensued some discussion which resulted in the adoption of these two resolutions relating to House of Representatives Bill 3342:

A

It was moved that members of the Association of American Colleges assembled in annual convention convey to the members of Congress their strong approval of the amendment to H.R. 3342 as now set forth in Section 2, whereby the fundamental distinction between information services and educational exchange services is recognized in the statement of the dual objectives of the Act; also their recommendation that the Act be further amended to require complete organizational and administrative separation of information services from educational exchange services in the Department of State. The motion was carried unanimously.

B

It was moved that the members of the Association of American Colleges assembled in annual convention convey to the members of Congress:

First, their conviction that inasmuch as educational, scientific and cultural institutions have developed under the auspices of state and local governments and private enterprise, it follows that a program of international education exchange appropriate to American traditions should, for the most part, stem from these institutions.

Second, their belief in the soundness of the policy established by Congress in providing for a representative National Commission on Educational, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation to advise the government in these matters, to perform the function of liaison between the government and the educational and cultural institutions of the country, and to assist the latter in coordinating their programs.

Third, their concern that Sections 601 and 602 of the Act as now amended provide for a United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchanges of five members without stating the relation of this Commission to the National Commission for Educational, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation; and their apprehension lest this omission result in confusion and overlapping of function and hence frustrate rather than facilitate the international programs of America's educational, scientific and cultural institutions.

Fourth, the urgent request that the Congress study the possibility of either assigning the responsibility for advising on educational exchange to the National Commission for Educational, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation or its Executive Committee thus eliminating the necessity of a Commission on Educational Exchange services, or develop some other form of amendment designed to unify activities in this area and increase the effectiveness of the National Commission for Educational, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation. The motion was carried unanimously.

On behalf of the Commission on Liberal Education, a report was made by its chairman, President Gordon K. Chalmers of Kenyon College. On motion, it was voted that this report be received and published.

Permission was given for the filing of the following dissenting statement submitted by President Johnson of Howard University:

I wish to record my wholehearted agreement with paragraph one (1) of the report of the Commission on Liberal Education.

But I wish respectfully and with the most warm cordiality to record my strong dissent from the conclusions reached in paragraphs two, three and four (2, 3 and 4).

In recording this strong dissent, I wish just as strongly to affirm my solidarity with the Commission's concern to preserve all such achieved quality in higher education as thoroughgoing mastery of subject matter and the most rigorous methods may require, including continued attention to the most painstaking work in language.

I wish to record further my solidarity with their concern to have the leaders of higher education and of the State bear in mind differences in ability, and the necessity of providing educational opportunity for students on levels in keeping with their ability and of such rigor as brings their highest abilities to the best self-realization and power.

I think the majority members of the Commission have inaccurately read into the report of the President's Commission an attack upon and an imperilment of these qualitative aspects of existing higher education at its best, and that this reading has led them to reach a conclusion which may have the effect of frustrating the admirable and wholly necessitous social purposes of the report—namely to intensify the transitive social power of higher education and to extend its clearly possible benefits to that very large number and proportion of our high school graduates and citizens who, for one reason or another, are not now served at all by our higher educational system.

President A. R. Keppel of Catawba College spoke as chairman of the Commission on Christian Higher Education. He was followed by Secretary Gould Wickey of this Commission. Both addresses are found elsewhere in this BULLETIN.

President Keppel presented the Reverend Robert N. DuBose who has been appointed fulltime secretary to the Commission. A rising vote of thanks was given to the retiring secretary, Dr. Wickey, for his leadership of the Commission and its allied interests, for the past thirteen years.

Then was presented a proposal for a national scholarship program (see p. 156) by President Leonard Carmichael of Tufts College, chairman of a special committee appointed for this purpose at the Annual Meeting of the Association held in Boston in January, 1947.

On motion of President David D. Henry of Wayne University, it was voted to discuss the report by sections.

On motion, the first three sections were adopted without debate. After the reading of the fourth and last section, Dean Mark Ingraham of the University of Wisconsin moved to eliminate the following sentence:

This is interpreted to mean that the Association does not favor legislation requiring that all or any part of such contracts must be made with any one type of institution, such as the Land Grant Colleges, non-publicly supported universities or Liberal Arts Colleges.

After discussion by Dean Ingraham, President Carmichael, and President Welch of Alma College, the proposed amendment was lost. Thereupon the Association voted favorably for the resolutions *in toto*.

On behalf of the Commission on Teacher Education, its chairman, President William W. Whitehouse of Albion College, presented its report with recommendations which were approved by the Association.

Fourth Session

The annual dinner, unusually well attended, was held at 7:00 P.M. With appropriate and gracious remarks, President Horton presented three presidents seated at the speakers' table who had been presidents of their respective colleges for 30 years or more: Howard E. Rondthaler, President for 40 years of Salem College, Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Weir C. Kettler, President of Grove City College, Pennsylvania, for 32 years; Charles E. Diehl, President for 30 years of Southwestern in Memphis, Tennessee.

President Horton then presented with felicitous remarks the president-elect of the Association, President Kenneth I. Brown of Denison University. The first official act of President Brown was to introduce Joseph Knitzer, violinist on the Arts Program of the Association, who rendered brilliantly a series of numbers from the old masters.

With complimentary observations on the magnificent chairmanship during the previous sessions of the meeting by President Horton, Dr. Brown introduced her for her presidential address.

President Brown next presented President O. C. Carmichael of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, who delivered an address on "Maintaining High Quality in the Colleges."

Fifth Session

The Wednesday morning session was opened promptly at 9:30 A.M. with President Horton in the chair.

Chancellor William P. Tolley of Syracuse University, who had been appointed by the Board to be chairman of a special committee for the purpose, presented a statement and report on "Minority Groups in Higher Education," to be found on p. 150.

President Mordecai Johnson spoke in favor of the appointment of a national commission by the Board of Directors, as recommended in the report, but requested that instructions concerning legislation be given this commission. Father Meyer of St. John's University (Brooklyn) expressed opposition to this suggestion.

President Clement of Atlanta University moved that the recommendation in the report concerning the authorization of the appointment of the commission be adopted without action being taken on other sections of the report. This motion was discussed by President Turck of Macalester College, President Jones of Earlham College, President Sparling of Roosevelt College, President Marsh of Boston University, President Case of Washington and Jefferson College, President Eddy of Adelphi College. Approval was voted to this motion.

President James H. Case, Jr., of Washington and Jefferson College moved:

That the Association of American Colleges recommend and work toward the repeal of all legislation restricting the right of any institution to admit qualified students without regard to race, color, or creed.

After further discussion by President McClelland of MacMurray College, President Guerry of the University of the South, President Diehl of Southwestern, President Johnson of Howard University, President Beittel of Talladega College and President Smith of Susquehanna University, the Case amendment was carried by a vote of 220 to 91.

It was then moved by President Eddy of Adelphi, seconded by President McClelland of MacMurray, that the following recommendation, contained in the report, be adopted:

That the problem of discrimination in admission policies should be solved by education and voluntary action and not by coercive legislation.

This motion was discussed further by President Turck of Macalester College, Father Rooney of the Jesuit Educational Association, President McClelland of MacMurray College, President Sparling of Roosevelt College, Dean Ingraham of the University of Wisconsin. The motion of President Jones of Bennett College to lay the amendment on the table was lost. On call for the vote, the record showed 261 in favor and 40 opposed to President Eddy's motion.

The following Minority Report was filed by President Johnson of Howard University:

On behalf of the minority point of view and at the request of those who supported it, I wish to record this objection to the majority vote by which this body has undertaken to discourage efforts to remove discrimination against citizens on account of race, creed, color or national origin from the practices of American colleges, by recourse to law.

In the United States the laws are not the expression of administrative fiat put forth to coerce the people, but the crystallized judgment of the community as a whole regarding the ways in which the citizens shall deal with each other. They arise out of the consent of the people and are made effective through their consenting obedience.

It is our pride before the world that those who are aggrieved by current practice may, without hindrance or opprobrium, seek a redress of their grievances through the courts, under present law, or through legislative action by the modification or amendment of existing law.

When a minority body of citizens is systematically discriminated against and substantially excluded from obtaining educational advantages necessary for their life, by institutions, whether of public or private control, which directly or indirectly benefit by the taxes of the people, it is a proper matter for public concern and for the community as a whole to express its will by law, on the question as to whether the said use of the peoples' tax funds, either directly or indirectly, is consistent with the exclusion of qualified citizens from the educational benefits of these institutions.

If, as the report of the Committee on Minorities states, the members of this body are unanimous in their purpose to eliminate exclusion on account of race, color, creed and ancestry from our current educational practice, and to see to it that all institutions of higher education, private and public, shall admit citizens of every race, creed, color and ancestry, it cannot be objectionable for the entire community of a state, through its elected representatives, to declare that this purpose is the recorded public will and that the acceptance of this purpose is implied in the direct or indirect acceptance of tax funds, whether by appropriation or through tax exemption.

And in these times of crisis, when the widespread prevalence of discrimination and exclusion so obviously operates to injure the life of more than one minority of our citizens, and to cause the democratic purposes of our nation to be questioned broadly in the world, it seems to us not only timely but necessitous that the public will be so expressed, in this and such other needful ways as may appear, to guar-

antee the colleges and universities shall, in fact, admit and educate all qualified citizens and shall not exclude them from precious educational opportunities on account of their race, creed, color or ancestry.

On behalf of the Commission on Citizenship, whose chairman, President Philip C. Nash of the University of Toledo, died during the year, President Charles J. Smith of Roanoke College, presented the following report:

The Commission on Citizenship believes unanimously that, following the excellent study and report of the Commission on Liberal Education, the Association of American Colleges next meets both the duty and the responsibility of strengthening the work of its member institutions in the training of youth for the understanding and for the discharge of the privileges of citizenship.

Therefore, the Commission recommends:

1. That the officers of the Association of American Colleges be requested to provide or secure funds ranging from \$10,000 to \$15,000 in order that there may be undertaken a study of the work now being done specifically in the field of education for citizenship by the member colleges and universities of this Association.

2. That this study shall be followed by a conference of the Commission on Citizenship and selected consultants, called together to consider the results of the study and to outline a future program of action based on the facts as they appear.

3. That the Commission on Citizenship be reorganized by the Board of Directors in such a way as best to implement this resolution.

4. That the Commission be instructed to report to the Board of Directors not later than January 1, 1949.

After discussion by President Marsh of Boston University and President Smith of Roanoke College, the above report was unanimously adopted.

Likewise, unanimous approval was given to the recommendations of the report of the Committee on Insurance and Annuities by Dean Mark H. Ingraham of the University of Wisconsin. (See pp. 142, 143).

On motion the report of the Resolutions Committee, presented by its chairman, President David D. Henry of Wayne University, was adopted:

RESOLUTIONS

I

Resolved: That the delegates to the thirty-fourth annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges record their appreciation of the gracious and effective leadership given by the President, Mildred McAfee Horton, and testify to the high place which her administration will hold among the numerous and important achievements of the Association; that the Association expresses gratitude to the officers, committees, commissions, speakers, and particularly to Guy E. Snively, Executive Director, for faithful, devoted, and efficient service to the Association, the Association recognizing that it is such unselfish dedication to the cause of higher education as exemplified by them which makes possible the continuation of the important work of the Association.

II

Resolved: That the Association is genuinely grateful to the University of Cincinnati and to other local institutions and organizations for the warm hospitality accorded the delegates.

III

Resolved: That the Association urges American colleges and universities to extend their efforts to receive foreign students and to utilize a larger number of foreign scholars on their faculties, both as a means of promoting international good will leading toward continual peace, and as a means of contributing to the opportunities of American students to broaden their understanding of the international quality of education, culture, and science.

IV

In view of the continued need among students and professors in war devastated areas,

And since UNESCO again has designated education relief and reconstruction as first priority for this year,

The Association of American Colleges urges all of its members to take constructive action upon the matter of International Educational Relief and Reconstruction, and to encourage students and faculty members to participate actively and generously in the appeal of UNESCO set forth by the Commission on International Educational Reconstruction and the recently published *Book of Needs*.

In this connection we record commendation of the work of World Student Service Fund, now in its tenth year of

service as an agency through which students and professors in American colleges may contribute on a humanitarian basis to the needs of fellow students and professors in the institutions of higher education in war devastated countries.

V

Resolved: That the Association reaffirms its position of a year ago, that a national research foundation should include within its concern and jurisdiction research in the humanities and social sciences and technology and the Association directs its officers to present this point of view of the Association to the appropriate governmental agencies dealing with legislation on this subject.

Sixth Session

The final session of the meeting was held at a 1:00 P.M. luncheon. Excellent addresses were given by President Charles P. Taft of the Federal Council of Churches in America and Dean Harold A. Bosley of the Duke University Divinity School.

* * *

On January 12 all the commissions and committees of the Association held meetings. On that day was held also a well-attended meeting of the American Conference of Academic Deans. There were sessions also of the Executive Committee of the Division of Higher Education of the National Catholic Educational Association and the University Senate of the Methodist Board of Education.

On the afternoon of January 14 and throughout January 15 and 16 were held a number of meetings of denominational educational groups and of the National Protestant Council on Higher Education.

The records indicate an attendance of 750 delegates at the Annual Meeting of the Association, probably the largest number ever present, except at the memorable meeting held in Baltimore in January 1942, shortly after the sneak attack of the Japanese on Pearl Harbor.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR
THE YEAR ENDING JANUARY, 1949

GUY E. SNAVELY
Executive Director

726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.
19 W. 44th Street, New York 18, N. Y.

President: Kenneth I. Brown, President, Denison University.

Vice President: Vincent J. Flynn, President, College of St. Thomas.

Treasurer: LeRoy E. Kimball, Vice Chancellor, New York University.

Executive Director: Guy E. Snavely.

—*Executive Director Emeritus:* Robert L. Kelly, Claremont, California.

Board of Directors: (additional members) Carter Davidson, President, Union College; Alexander Guerry, President, University of the South; Winslow S. Anderson, President, Whitman College; Daniel L. Marsh, President, Boston University.

By order of the Association, in the case of universities the unit of membership is the university college of liberal arts. Unless otherwise indicated the name of the president or the chancellor is given in the column headed Executive Officer.

INSTITUTION

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

ALABAMA

Alabama College, Montevallo	John T. Caldwell
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn	R. B. Draughon, <i>Acting</i>
Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham	George R. Stuart
Howard College, Birmingham	Harwell G. Davis
Huntingdon College, Montgomery	Hubert Searcy
Judson College, Marion	J. I. Riddle
Miles College, Birmingham	W. A. Bell
Spring Hill College, Spring Hill	William P. Donnelly
Talladega College, Talladega	A. D. Beittel
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee	Frederick D. Patterson
University of Alabama, University	John M. Gallalee

ARIZONA

University of Arizona, Tucson	J. Byron McCormick
-------------------------------------	--------------------

ARKANSAS

Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, Pine Bluff

Lawrence A. Davis

Arkansas State College, Jonesboro.....	W. J. Edens
College of the Ozarks, Clarksville.....	Wiley Lin Hurie
Hendrix College, Conway.....	Matt L. Ellis
Ouachita College, Arkadelphia.....	James R. Grant
Philander Smith College, Little Rock.....	M. LaFayette Harris
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.....	Lewis Webster Jones

CALIFORNIA

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena.....	Lee A. Dubridge
Claremont Men's College, Claremont.....	George C. S. Benson
College of the Holy Names, Oakland.....	Sister M. Rose Emmanuel
College of the Pacific, Stockton.....	Robert E. Burns
Dominican College, San Rafael.....	Sister Mary Thomas
George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles.....	Hugh M. Tiner
Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles.....	Sister Mary Eucharist
La Sierra College, Arlington.....	G. T. Anderson
La Verne College, La Verne.....	C. Ernest Davis
Loyola University, Los Angeles.....	Edward J. Whelan
Mills College, Oakland.....	Lynn T. White, Jr.
Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles.....	Mother Marie de Lourdes
Occidental College, Los Angeles.....	Arthur G. Coons
Pacific Union College, Angwin.....	Percy W. Christian
Pasadena College, Pasadena.....	H. Orton Wiley
Pomona College, Claremont Colleges, Claremont.....	E. Wilson Lyon
St. Mary's College, St. Mary's College P. O.....	Brother Austin
San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco.....	Mother Leonor Mejia
Scripps College, Claremont Colleges, Claremont.....	Frederick Hard
Stanford University, Stanford University.....	Alvin C. Eurich, Acting
University of Redlands, Redlands.....	George H. Armacost
University of San Francisco, San Francisco.....	William J. Dunne
University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara.....	William C. Gianera
University of Southern California, Los Angeles.....	Fred D. Fagg, Jr.
Whittier College, Whittier.....	Wm. C. Jones

COLORADO

Colorado College, Colorado Springs.....	Thurston J. Davies
Loretto Heights College, Loretto.....	Sister Frances Marie
University of Colorado, Boulder.....	Robert L. Stearns
University of Denver, Denver.....	James F. Price, Acting

CONNECTICUT

Albertus Magnus College, New Haven.....	Sister Irmina Longstreth
Connecticut College, New London.....	Rosemary Park
Saint Joseph College, West Hartford.....	Sister M. Rosa, Dean
Trinity College, Hartford.....	G. Keith Funston
Wesleyan University, Middletown.....	Victor L. Butterfield
Yale University, New Haven.....	Charles Seymour

DELAWARE

University of Delaware, Newark.....William S. Carlson

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

American University, Washington.....Paul F. Douglass
 Catholic University of America, Washington.....P. J. McCormick
 Dunbarton College of Holy Cross, Washington.....Sister Mary Frederick
 George Washington University, Washington.....C. H. Marvin
 Georgetown University, Washington.....Lawrence C. Gorman
 Howard University, Washington.....Mordecai W. Johnson
 Trinity College, Washington.....Sister Catherine Dorothea
 Washington Missionary College, Takoma Park.....William H. Shephard

FLORIDA

Barry College, Miami.....Sister M. Dorothy, *Dean*
 Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College, Tallahassee.....Wm. H. Gray, Jr.
 Florida Southern College, Lakeland.....Ludd M. Spivey
 Florida State University, Tallahassee.....Doak S. Campbell
 John B. Stetson University, Deland.....J. Ollie Edmunds
 Rollins College, Winter Park.....Hamilton Holt
 University of Florida, Gainesville.....J. Hillis Miller
 University of Miami, Coral Gables.....Bowman F. Ashe

GEORGIA

Agnes Scott College, Decatur.....James R. McCain
 Atlanta University, Atlanta.....Rufus E. Clement
 Berry College, Mount Berry.....James A. Lindsay
 Bessie Tift College, Forsyth.....C. L. McGinty
 Brenau College, Gainesville.....Josiah Crudup
 Clark College, Atlanta.....James P. Brawley
 Emory University, Emory University.....Goodrich C. White
 Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta.....Blake R. Van Leer
 Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville.....Guy H. Wells
 Georgia State Womans College, Valdosta.....Frank R. Reade
 LaGrange College, LaGrange.....H. T. Quillian
 Mercer University, Macon.....Spright Dowell
 Morehouse College, Atlanta.....Benjamin E. Mays
 Morris Brown College, Atlanta.....Wm. A. Fountain, Jr.
 Paine College, Augusta.....E. C. Peters
 Piedmont College, Demorest.....A. R. Van Cleave
 Shorter College, Rome.....Paul M. Cousins
 Spelman College, Atlanta.....Florence M. Read
 University of Georgia, Athens.....Harmon W. Caldwell
 Wesleyan College, Macon.....Silas Johnson

HAWAII

University of Hawaii, Honolulu.....Gregg M. Sinclair

IDAHO

College of Idaho, Caldwell.....	L. A. Williams, <i>Acting</i>
Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa.....	L. T. Corlett

ILLINOIS

Augustana College, Rock Island.....	Conrad Bergendoff
Aurora College, Aurora.....	Theodore Pierson Stephens
Barat College of the Sacred Heart, Lake Forest.....	Mother Eleanor Regan
Bradley University, Peoria.....	David B. Owen
Carthage College, Carthage.....	Erland Nelson
College of St. Frances, Joliet.....	Sister M. Aniceta
De Paul University, Chicago.....	Comerford O'Malley
Elmhurst College, Elmhurst.....	Henry W. Dinkmeyer
Eureka College, Eureka.....	Burrus Dickinson
George Williams College, Chicago.....	Harold C. Coffman
Greenville College, Greenville.....	Henry J. Long
Illinois College, Jacksonville.....	H. Gary Hudson
Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington.....	Merrill J. Holmes
James Millikin University, Decatur.....	J. Walter Malone
Knox College, Galesburg.....	Lyndon O. Brown
Lake Forest College, Lake Forest.....	Ernest A. Johnson
Loyola University, Chicago.....	James T. Hussey
MacMurray College, Jacksonville.....	Clarence P. McClelland
McKendree College, Lebanon.....	Carl C. Bracy
Monmouth College, Monmouth.....	J. H. Grier
Mundelein College, Chicago.....	Sister Mary Josephine
North Central College, Naperville.....	C. Harve Geiger
Northwestern University, Evanston.....	Franklyn Bliss Snyder
Quincy College, Quincy.....	Seraphin Tibesar
Rockford College, Rockford.....	Mary Ashby Cheek
Roosevelt College of Chicago.....	Edward J. Sparling
Rosary College, River Forest.....	Sister Mary Peter Doyle
St. Francis Xavier College for Women, Chicago.....	Sister Mary Huberta
Shurtleff College, Alton.....	David A. Weaver
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.....	Chester F. Lay
The Principia, Elsau.....	F. E. Morgan
University of Chicago, Chicago.....	Robert M. Hutchins
University of Illinois, Urbana.....	George D. Stoddard
Wheaton College, Wheaton.....	V. R. Edman

INDIANA

Anderson College, Anderson.....	J. A. Morrison
Butler University, Indianapolis.....	Maurice O. Ross
DePauw University, Greencastle.....	Clyde E. Wildman
Earlham College, Richmond.....	Thomas E. Jones
Evansville College, Evansville.....	Lincoln B. Hale
Franklin College, Franklin.....	William G. Spencer

Goshen College, Goshen.....	Ernest E. Miller
Hanover College, Hanover.....	Albert G. Parker, Jr.
Indiana Central College, Indianapolis.....	I. Lynd Each
Indiana University, Bloomington.....	Herman B. Wells
Manchester College, North Manchester.....	V. F. Schwalm
Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute.....	Donald B. Prentice
St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods.....	Mother Mary Bernard
St. Mary's College, Notre Dame.....	Sister M. Madeleva
Taylor University, Upland.....	Clyde W. Meredith
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame.....	John J. Cavanaugh
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso.....	O. P. Kretzmann
Wabash College, Crawfordsville.....	Frank Hugh Sparks

IOWA

Briar Cliff College, Sioux City.....	Sister Jean Marie
Central College, Pella.....	G. T. Vander Lugt
Clarke College, Dubuque.....	Sister Mary Anne Leone
Coe College, Cedar Rapids.....	Byron S. Hollinshead
Cornell College, Mt. Vernon.....	Russell D. Cole
Drake University, Des Moines.....	Henry Gadd Harmon
Grinnell College, Grinnell.....	Samuel Nowell Stevens
Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant.....	Stanley B. Niles
Loras College, Dubuque.....	M. J. Martin
Luther College, Decorah.....	O. J. H. Preus
Morningside College, Sioux City.....	Earl A. Roadman
Parsons College, Fairfield.....	Tom E. Shearer, <i>Acting</i>
St. Ambrose College, Davenport.....	Ambrose J. Burke
Simpson College, Indianola.....	Edwin E. Voigt
State University of Iowa, Iowa City.....	Virgil M. Hancher
University of Dubuque, Dubuque.....	Samuel S. George, <i>Acting</i>
Upper Iowa University, Fayette.....	Vivian T. Smith
William Penn College, Oskaloosa.....	Cecil Hinshaw

KANSAS

Baker University, Baldwin.....	Nelson P. Horn
Bethany College, Lindsborg.....	Emory Lindquist
Bethel College, North Newton.....	Edmund G. Kaufman
College of Emporia, Emporia.....	Daniel A. Hirschler
Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays.....	Lyman D. Wooster
Friends University, Wichita.....	S. Arthur Watson
Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina.....	Herbert J. Root
Marymount College, Salina.....	Mother Mary Chrysostom Wynn
McPherson College, McPherson.....	W. W. Peters
Mount St. Scholastica College, Atchison.....	Mother Lucy Dooley
Ottawa University, Ottawa.....	Andrew B. Martin
St. Mary College, Xavier.....	A. M. Murphy

Southwestern College, Winfield.....	Mearl P. Culver
Sterling College, Sterling.....	William M. McCreery
University of Wichita, Wichita.....	W. M. Jardine
Washburn Municipal University, Topeka.....	Bryan S. Stoffer

KENTUCKY

Asbury College, Wilmore.....	Z. T. Johnson
Berea College, Berea.....	Francis Stephenson Hutchins
Centre College, Danville.....	Walter A. Groves
Georgetown College, Georgetown.....	Samuel S. Hill
Kentucky Wesleyan College, Winchester.....	Paul Shell Powell
Nazareth College, Louisville.....	Sister Mary Anastasia Coady
Transylvania College, Lexington.....	Raymond F. McLain
Union College, Barbourville.....	Conway Boatman
University of Kentucky, Lexington.....	Herman Lee Donovan
University of Louisville, Louisville.....	John W. Taylor

LOUISIANA

Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport.....	Joe J. Mickle
Dillard University, New Orleans.....	Albert W. Dent
H. Sophie Newcomb Memorial College for Women, New Orleans	Logan Wilson, <i>Dean</i>
Louisiana College, Pineville.....	Edgar Godbold
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston.....	Claybrook Cottingham
Louisiana State University, University.....	Harold W. Stoke
Loyola University, New Orleans.....	Thomas J. Shields
Northwestern State College, Natchitoches.....	Joseph E. Gibson
Southern University, Scotlandville.....	F. G. Clark
Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette.....	Joel L. Fletcher
Tulane University, New Orleans.....	R. C. Harris
Ursuline College, New Orleans.....	Mother Margaret Mary Clark
Xavier University, New Orleans.....	Mother M. Agatha

MAINE

Bates College, Lewiston.....	Chas. F. Phillips
Bowdoin College, Brunswick.....	Kenneth C. M. Sills
Colby College, Waterville.....	Julius Seelye Bixler
St. Joseph's College, Portland.....	Sister Mary Honoratus, <i>Dean</i>
University of Maine, Orono.....	Arthur A. Hauck

MARYLAND

College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore.....	Sister Mary Frances
Goucher College, Baltimore.....	David A. Robertson
Hood College, Frederick.....	Henry I. Stahr
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.....	Isaiah Bowman
Loyola College, Baltimore.....	Francis X. Talbot
Morgan State College, Baltimore.....	D. O. W. Holmes

Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg	J. L. Sheridan
St. John's College, Annapolis,	John S. Kieffer
St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg.....	Francis J. Dodd
United States Naval Academy, Annapolis.....	J. L. Holloway, Jr.
University of Maryland, College Park.....	H. C. Byrd
Washington College, Chestertown.....	Gilbert W. Mead
Western Maryland College, Westminster	Lowell S. Ensor
Woodstock College, Woodstock.....	Joseph C. Glose, <i>Dean</i>

MASSACHUSETTS

American International College, Springfield.....	William Gellerman
Amherst College, Amherst.....	Charles W. Cole
Atlantic Union College, South Lancaster.....	G. Eric Jones
Boston College, Chestnut Hill.....	William L. Keleher
Boston University, Boston.....	Daniel L. Marsh
Clark University, Worcester.....	Howard B. Jefferson
College of Our Lady of the Elms, Chicopee.....	John R. Rooney, <i>Vice-Pres.</i>
College of the Holy Cross, Worcester.....	William J. Healy
Eastern Nazarene College, Quincy.....	Samuel Young
Emmanuel College, Boston	Sister Margaret Patricia
Harvard University, Cambridge.....	James B. Conant
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.....	Robert G. Caldwell, <i>Dean</i>
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley.....	Roswell G. Ham
Northeastern University, Boston.....	Carl S. Ell
Regis College, Weston	Sister Mary Saint Ignatius
Simmons College, Boston.....	Bancroft Beatley
Smith College, Northampton.....	Herbert J. Davis
Springfield College, Springfield.....	Paul M. Limbert
Tufts College, Tufts College.....	Leonard Carmichael
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	Ralph A. Van Meter, <i>Acting</i>
Wellesley College, Wellesley.....	Mildred McAfee Horton
Wheaton College, Norton.....	A. Howard Meneely
Williams College, Williamstown.....	James P. Baxter, III
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester.....	Wat Tyler Cluverius

MICHIGAN

Adrian College, Adrian.....	Samuel J. Harrison
Albion College, Albion.....	William W. Whitehouse
Alma College, Alma	Dale D. Welch
Calvin College, Grand Rapids.....	Henry Schultze
Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs.....	Alvin W. Johnson
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale.....	Harvey Leonard Turner
Hope College, Holland.....	Irwin J. Lubbers
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo.....	Paul L. Thompson
Marygrove College, Detroit.....	Sister M. Honora
Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, East Lansing.....	John A. Hannah

Nazareth College, Nazareth.....	Sister M. Kevin
Olivet College, Olivet.....	Malcolm B. Dana
Siena Heights College, Adrian.....	Mother M. Gerald
University of Detroit, Detroit.....	Wm. J. Millor
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.....	A. G. Ruthven
Wayne University, Detroit.....	David D. Henry

MINNESOTA

Augsburg College, Minneapolis.....	Bernhard Christensen
Carleton College, Northfield.....	Laurence M. Gould
College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph.....	Sister Incarnata Girgen, <i>Dean</i>
College of St. Catherine, St. Paul.....	Sister Antonius Kennelly
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth.....	Mother M. Anthanasius Braegelman
College of St. Teresa, Winona.....	Sister M. Rachel Dady
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul.....	Vincent J. Flynn
Concordia College, Moorhead.....	J. N. Brown
Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter.....	Edgar M. Carlson
Hamline University, St. Paul.....	Charles N. Pace
Macalester College, St. Paul.....	Charles J. Turck
St. Mary's College, Winona.....	Brother Joel
St. Olaf College, Northfield.....	Clemens M. Granskou
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.....	T. Raymond McConnell, <i>Dean</i>

MISSISSIPPI

Belhaven College, Jackson.....	G. T. Gillespie
Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain.....	Lawrence T. Lowrey
Millsaps College, Jackson.....	Marion L. Smith
Mississippi College, Clinton.....	D. M. Nelson
Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg.....	R. C. Cook
Mississippi State College, State College.....	Fred T. Mitchell
Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus.....	B. L. Parkinson
University of Mississippi, University.....	John D. Williams

MISSOURI

Central College, Fayette.....	E. P. Puckett, <i>Acting</i>
College of St. Teresa, Kansas City.....	Sister Marietta Jennings
Culver-Stockton College, Canton.....	W. H. McDonald
Drury College, Springfield.....	James Franklin Findlay
Fontbonne College, St. Louis.....	Mother M. Bernice O'Neill
Lindenwood College, St. Charles.....	Franc L. McCluer
Maryville College, St. Louis.....	Mother Marie-Odéide Mouton
Missouri Valley College, Marshall.....	J. R. Cable
Park College, Parkville.....	J. L. Zwingle
Rockhurst College, Kansas City.....	Thomas J. Knapp
St. Louis University, St. Louis.....	Patrick James Holloran
Tarkio College, Tarkio.....	M. Earle Collins
University of Kansas City, Kansas City.....	Clarence R. Decker

University of Missouri, Columbia.....	F. A. Middlebush
Washington University, St. Louis.....	Arthur H. Compton
Webster College, Webster Groves.....	George F. Donovan
Westminster College, Fulton.....	William W. Hall, Jr.
William Jewell College, Liberty.....	Walter Pope Binns

MONTANA

Carroll College, Helena.....	Emmet J. Riley
College of Great Falls, Great Falls.....	J. J. Donovan
Montana State University, Missoula.....	James A. McCain
Rocky Mountain College, Billings.....	William D. Copeland

NEBRASKA

Creighton University, Omaha.....	William H. McCabe
Doane College, Crete.....	H. M. Gage, <i>Acting</i>
Duchesne College, Omaha.....	Mother Helen Casey
Hastings College, Hastings.....	Wm. Marshall French
Midland College, Fremont.....	W. F. Hieronymus
Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln.....	John L. Knight
Union College, Lincoln.....	Robert W. Woods
University of Nebraska, Lincoln.....	R. G. Gustavson
University of Omaha, Omaha.....	Rowland Haynes
York College, York.....	Walter E. Bachman

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dartmouth College, Hanover.....	John S. Dickey
Mount St. Mary College, Hooksett.....	Sister M. De La Salle
St. Anselm's College, Manchester.....	Bertrand C. Dolan
University of New Hampshire, Durham.....	Arthur S. Adams

NEW JERSEY

Brothers College, Drew University, Madison.....	Arlo A. Brown
College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station.....	Sister Marie José Byrne
Georgian Court College, Lakewood.....	Mother Mary John
New Jersey College for Women, Rutgers University, New Brunswick.....	Margaret T. Corwin, <i>Dean</i>
Princeton University, Princeton.....	Harold W. Dodds
Rutgers University, New Brunswick.....	Robert C. Clothier
St. Peter's College, Jersey City.....	Vincent J. Hart
Seton Hall College, South Orange.....	James F. Kelley
Upsala College, East Orange.....	Evald B. Lawson

NEW MEXICO

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.....	John P. Wernette
--	------------------

NEW YORK

Adelphi College, Garden City.....	Paul D. Eddy
-----------------------------------	--------------

Alfred University, Alfred	J. E. Walters
Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson	Edward C. Fuller
Barnard College, Columbia University, New York	
	Millicent Carey McIntosh, <i>Dean</i>
Brooklyn College, Brooklyn	Harry David Gideonse
Canisius College, Buffalo	Raymond W. Schouten
Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam	Jesse H. Davis, <i>Acting</i>
Colgate University, Hamilton	Everett Needham Case
College of the City of New York, New York	Harry N. Wright
College of Mount St. Vincent, New York	Sister Catherine Marie, <i>Dean</i>
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle	M. Thomas Aquinas, <i>Dean</i>
College of St. Rose, Albany	Sister Rose of Lima, <i>Dean</i>
Columbia College, Columbia University, New York	Harry J. Carman, <i>Dean</i>
Cornell University, Ithaca	Edmund E. Day
D'Youville College, Buffalo	Sister Jane Frances
Elmira College, Elmira	Wm. S. A. Pott
Fordham University, New York	Robert I. Gannon
Good Counsel College, White Plains	Mother M. Aloysia
Hamilton College, Clinton	Thomas B. Rudd
Hartwick College, Oneonta	Henry J. Arnold
Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva	Alan W. Brown
Hofstra College, Hempstead	J. C. Adams
Houghton College, Houghton	Stephen W. Paine
Hunter College, New York	George N. Shuster
Keuka College, Keuka Park	Katherine G. Blyley
Manhattan College, New York	Brother Bonaventure Thomas
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, New York	
	Mother Eleanor M. O'Byrne
Marymount College, Tarrytown	Mother M. Gerard
Nazareth College, Rochester	Sister Teresa Marie, <i>Dean</i>
New York University, New York	Harry Woodburn Chase
Niagara University, Niagara Falls	Francis L. Meade
Notre Dame College of Staten Island, Grymes Hill	Mother St. Egbert
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn	Harry S. Rogers
Queens College, Flushing	Paul Klapper
Russell Sage College, Troy	Helen M. McKinstry
St. Bonaventure College, St. Bonaventure	Thomas Plassman
St. Francis College, Brooklyn	Brother Columba
St. John's University, Brooklyn	John A. Flynn
St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn	William T. Dillon
St. Lawrence University, Canton	Eugene G. Bewkes
Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville	Harold Taylor
Siena College, Loudonville	Mark Kennedy
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs	Henry T. Moore
Syracuse University, Syracuse	William P. Tolley
Union College, Schenectady	Carter Davidson
United States Military Academy, West Point	Maxwell D. Taylor

University of Buffalo, Buffalo.....	Samuel P. Capen
University of Rochester, Rochester.....	Alan C. Valentine
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie.....	Sarah G. Blanding
Wagner College, Staten Island.....	Walter C. Langsam
Wells College, Aurora.....	Richard L. Greene
Yeshiva University, New York.....	Samuel Belkin

NORTH CAROLINA

Agricultural and Technical College, Greensboro.....	F. D. Bluford
Bennett College, Greensboro.....	David D. Jones
Catawba College, Salisbury.....	Alvin Robert Keppel
Davidson College, Davidson.....	John R. Cunningham
Duke University, Durham.....	Robert L. Flowers
Elon College, Elon College.....	L. E. Smith
Flora Macdonald College, Red Springs.....	Henry G. Bedinger
Greensboro College, Greensboro.....	Luther L. Gobbel
Guilford College, Guilford.....	Clyde A. Milner
High Point College, High Point.....	Gideon I. Humphreys
Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte.....	Hardy Liston
Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory.....	P. E. Monroe
Livingstone College, Salisbury.....	W. J. Trent
Meredith College, Raleigh.....	Carlyle Campbell
North Carolina College at Durham.....	Albert E. Manley, <i>Acting</i>
Queens College, Charlotte.....	Hunter B. Blakely
Salem College, Winston-Salem.....	H. E. Rondthaler
Shaw University, Raleigh.....	Robert P. Daniel
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.....	Frank P. Graham
Wake Forest College, Wake Forest.....	Thurman D. Kitchin

NORTH DAKOTA

Jamestown College, Jamestown.....	Howard J. Bell, Jr.
-----------------------------------	---------------------

OHIO

Antioch College, Yellow Springs.....	W. B. Alexander, <i>Acting</i>
Ashland College, Ashland.....	Raymond W. Bixler
Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea.....	Louis C. Wright
Bluffton College, Bluffton.....	Lloyd L. Ramseyer
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green.....	Frank J. Prout
Capital University, Columbus.....	Harold L. Yochum
College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph.....	Sister Maria Corona, <i>Dean</i>
College of Wooster, Wooster.....	Howard F. Lowry
Defiance College, Defiance.....	Harold Dana Hopkins
Denison University, Granville.....	Kenneth I. Brown
Fenn College, Cleveland.....	Joseph C. Nichols, <i>Acting</i>
Findlay College, Findlay.....	H. Clifford Fox
Heidelberg College, Tiffin.....	Terry Wickham
Hiram College, Hiram.....	Paul H. Fall

John Carroll University, Cleveland	Frederick E. Welfle
Kent State University, Kent	Geo. A. Bowman
Kenyon College, Gambier	Gordon Keith Chalmers
Lake Erie College, Painesville	Helen D. Bragdon
Marietta College, Marietta	W. Bay Irvine, <i>Acting</i>
Mary Manse College, Toledo	Sister M. Catherine Raynor
Miami University, Oxford	Ernest H. Hahne
Mount Union College, Alliance	Charles B. Ketcham
Muskingum College, New Concord	Robert N. Montgomery
Notre Dame College, South Euclid	Mother Mary Vera Niess
Oberlin College, Oberlin	William E. Stevenson
Ohio Northern University, Ada	Robert O. McClure
Ohio State University, Columbus	H. L. Bevis
Ohio University, Athens	John C. Baker
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware	C. E. Ficken, <i>Acting</i>
Otterbein College, Westerville	J. Gordon Howard
St. Mary of the Springs College, Columbus	Sister Angelita Conley
University of Akron, Akron	H. E. Simmons
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati	Raymond Walters
University of Dayton, Dayton	George J. Renneker
University of Toledo, Toledo	Wilbur W. White
Ursuline College, Cleveland	Mother Marie
Western College, Oxford	Philip E. Henderson
Western Reserve University, Cleveland	W. G. Leutner
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce	Charles L. Hill
Wilmington College, Wilmington	Samuel D. Marble
Wittenberg College, Springfield	Rees E. Tulloss
Xavier University, Cincinnati	C. J. Steiner
Youngstown College, Youngstown	Howard W. Jones

OKLAHOMA

Bethany-Peniel College, Bethany	Roy H. Cantrell
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater	Henry G. Bennett
Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee	John W. Raley
Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City	C. Q. Smith
Phillips University, Enid	Eugene S. Briggs
University of Oklahoma, Norman	Geo. L. Cross
University of Tulsa, Tulsa	C. I. Pontius

OREGON

Lewis and Clark College, Portland	Morgan S. Odell
Linfield College, McMinnville	Harry L. Dillin
Pacific University, Forest Grove	Walter C. Giersbach
Reed College, Portland	Peter H. Odegard
University of Oregon, Eugene	Harry K. Newburn
University of Portland, Portland	Theodore J. Mehling
Willamette University, Salem	G. Herbert Smith

PENNSYLVANIA

Albright College, Reading	Harry V. Masters
Allegheny College, Meadville	C. A. Darling, <i>Acting</i>
Beaver College, Jenkintown	Raymon M. Kistler
Bucknell University, Lewisburg	Herbert L. Spencer
Cedar Crest College, Allentown	Dale H. Moore
Chestnut Hill College, Chestnut Hill	Sister Maria Kostka
College Misericordia, Dallas	Sister M. Gonzaga
Dickinson College, Carlisle	William W. Edel
Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia	James Creese
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh	Francis P. Smith
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown	A. C. Baugher
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster	Theodore A. Distler
Geneva College, Beaver Falls	McLeod M. Pearce
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg	Henry W. A. Hanson
Grove City College, Grove City	Weir C. Ketler
Haverford College, Haverford	Gilbert F. White
Immaculata College, Immaculata	Vincent L. Burns
Juniata College, Huntingdon	Calvert N. Ellis
Lafayette College, Easton	Ralph C. Hutchison
La Salle College, Philadelphia	Brother G. Paul
Lebanon Valley College, Annville	Clyde A. Lynch
Lehigh University, Bethlehem	Martin D. Whitaker
Lincoln University, Lincoln University	Horace M. Bond
Marywood College, Scranton	Sister M. Sylvia
Mercyhurst College, Erie	Sister M. Borgia Egan, <i>Dean</i>
Moravian College, Bethlehem	Raymond S. Hauptert
Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem	Edwin J. Heath
Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh	Mother M. Irenaeus
Muhlenberg College, Allentown	Levering Tyson
Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh	Paul R. Anderson
Pennsylvania State College, State College	James Milholland, <i>Acting</i>
Rosemont College, Rosemont	Mother Mary Boniface
St. Francis College, Loretto	Adrian Veigle
St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia	John J. Long
St. Vincent College, Latrobe	Alfred Koch
Seton Hill College, Greensburg	Sister M. Victoria, <i>Dean</i>
Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove	G. Morris Smith
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore	John W. Nason
Temple University, Philadelphia	Robert L. Johnson
Thiel College, Greenville	William F. Zimmerman
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia	George W. McClelland
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh	R. H. Fitzgerald
University of Scranton, Scranton	J. Eugene Gallery
Ursinus College, Collegeville	Norman E. McClure
Villa Maria College, Erie	Sister Mary Stella
Villanova College, Villanova	Francis X. N. McGuire

Washington and Jefferson College, Washington	James H. Case, Jr.
Waynesburg College, Waynesburg	Paul R. Stewart
Westminster College, New Wilmington	John Orr, <i>Acting</i>
Wilson College, Chambersburg	Paul Swain Havens

PUERTO RICO

Polytechnic Institute of Puerto Rico, San German	Edward G. Seel
--	----------------

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University, Providence	Henry M. Wriston
Pembroke College, Brown University, Providence	Margaret S. Morriss, <i>Dean</i>
Providence College, Providence	Robert J. Slavin
Rhode Island State College, Kingston	Carl R. Woodward

SOUTH CAROLINA

Coker College, Hartsville	Donald C. Agnew
College of Charleston, Charleston	George D. Grice
Columbia College, Columbia	J. Caldwell Guilds
Converse College, Spartanburg	Edward M. Gwathmey
Erskine College, Due West	Robert C. Grier
Furman University, Greenville	John L. Plyler
Lander College, Greenwood	John Marvin Rast
Limestone College, Gaffney	R. C. Granberry
Newberry College, Newberry	James C. Kinard
Presbyterian College, Clinton	Marshall W. Brown
State Agricultural and Mechanical College, Orangeburg	M. F. Whittaker
The Citadel, Charleston	C. P. Summerall
Winthrop College, Rock Hill	Henry R. Sims
Wofford College, Spartanburg	Walter K. Greene

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College, Sioux Falls	Lawrence M. Stavig
Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell	Sam Hilburn
Huron College, Huron	George F. McDougall
Yankton College, Yankton	J. Clark Graham

TENNESSEE

Cumberland University, Lebanon	Edwin S. Preston
Fisk University, Nashville	Charles S. Johnson
King College, Bristol	R. T. L. Liston
Knoxville College, Knoxville	J. Reed Miller
Lane College, Jackson	D. S. Yarbrough
Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate	Robert L. Kincaid
Maryville College, Maryville	Ralph W. Lloyd
Milligan College, Milligan	Virgil L. Elliott
Southwestern, Memphis	Charles E. Diehl
Tusculum College, Greeneville	George K. Davies

Union University, Jackson.....	W. F. Jones
University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga.....	David A. Loekmiller
University of the South, Sewanee.....	Alexander Guerry
University of Tennessee, Knoxville.....	C. E. Brehm, <i>Acting</i>
Vanderbilt University, Nashville.....	Harvie Branscomb

TEXAS

Abilene Christian College, Abilene.....	Don H. Morris
Austin College, Sherman.....	W. B. Guerrant
Baylor University, Waco.....	W. R. White
Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene.....	R. N. Richardson
Howard Payne College, Brownwood.....	Thomas H. Taylor
Incarinate Word College, San Antonio.....	Sister M. Columkille
Mary Hardin-Baylor College, Belton.....	Gordon G. Singleton
McMurry College, Abilene.....	Harold G. Cooke
Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio.....	John LaSalle McMahon
Rice Institute, Houston.....	William V. Houston
St. Edward's University, Austin.....	Edmund Hunt
St. Mary's University of San Antonio, San Antonio.....	Louis J. Blume
Southern Methodist University, Dallas.....	Umpfrey Lee
Southwestern University, Georgetown.....	J. N. R. Score
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth.....	M. E. Sadler
Texas College, Tyler.....	D. R. Glass
Texas College of Arts and Industries, Kingsville.....	Edward Newlon Jones
Texas College of Mines and Metallurgy, El Paso.....	D. M. Wiggins
Texas State College for Women, Denton.....	L. H. Hubbard
Texas Technological College, Lubbock.....	Wm. M. Whyburn
Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth.....	Law Sone
Trinity University, San Antonio.....	Monroe G. Everett
University of Texas, Austin.....	T. S. Painter
Wiley College, Marshall.....	Egbert C. McLeod

UTAH

Brigham Young University, Provo.....	Howard S. McDonald
University of Utah, Salt Lake City.....	Albert R. Olpin
Utah State Agricultural College, Logan.....	F. S. Harris
Westminster College, Salt Lake City.....	Robert D. Steele

VERMONT

Bennington College, Bennington.....	Frederick Burekhardt
Middlebury College, Middlebury.....	Samuel S. Stratton
Norwich University, Northfield.....	Homer L. Dodge
St. Michael's College, Winoski.....	Daniel P. Lyons
University of Vermont, Burlington.....	John S. Millis

VIRGINIA

Bridgewater College, Bridgewater.....	Jacob I. Baugher
---------------------------------------	------------------

College of William and Mary, Williamsburg	John E. Pomfret
Emory and Henry College, Emory	Foye G. Gibson
Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney	Edgar Graham Gammon
Hampton Institute, Hampton	Ralph Parkhurst Bridgman
Hollins College, Hollins	Bessie C. Randolph
Lynchburg College, Lynchburg	R. B. Montgomery
Madison College, Harrisonburg	Samuel P. Duke
Mary Baldwin College, Staunton	Frank B. Lewis
Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg	M. L. Combs
Randolph-Macon College, Ashland	J. Earl Moreland
Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg	Theodore H. Jack
Roanoke College, Salem	Charles J. Smith
Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar	Martha B. Lucas
University of Richmond, Richmond	George M. Modlin
University of Virginia, Charlottesville	Colgate W. Darden, Jr.
Virginia Military Institute, Lexington	Richard J. Marshall
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg	Walter S. Newman
Virginia State College, Petersburg	L. H. Foster
Virginia Union University, Richmond	J. Marcus Ellison
Washington and Lee University, Lexington	Francis P. Gaines

WASHINGTON

College of Puget Sound, Tacoma	Robert Franklin Thompson
Gonzaga University, Spokane	Francis E. Corkery
Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland	S. C. Eastvold
Seattle College, Seattle	Harold O. Small
Seattle Pacific College, Seattle	C. Hoyt Watson
University of Washington, Seattle	Raymond B. Allen
Whitman College, Walla Walla	Winslow S. Anderson
Whitworth College, Spokane	Frank F. Warren

WEST VIRGINIA

Bethany College, Bethany	W. H. Cramblet
Davis and Elkins College, Elkins	Raymond B. Purdum
Fairmont State College, Fairmont	George H. Hand
Marshall College, Huntington	Stewart H. Smith
Salem College, Salem	S. O. Bond
West Virginia State College, Institute	John W. Davis
West Virginia University, Morgantown	Irvin Stewart
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon	William J. Scarborough

WISCONSIN

Beloit College, Beloit	Carey Croneis
Carroll College, Waukesha	Nelson V. Russell
Lawrence College, Appleton	Nathan M. Pusey
Marquette University, Milwaukee	Peter A. Brooks

Milton College, Milton.....	Carroll L. Hill
Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee.....	Lucia R. Briggs
Mount Mary College, Milwaukee.....	Edward A. Fitzpatrick
Northland College, Ashland.....	L. H. Brumbaugh, <i>Acting</i>
Ripon College, Ripon.....	Carl G. Kuebler
University of Wisconsin, Madison.....	Mark H. Ingraham, <i>Dean</i>

WYOMING

University of Wyoming, Laramie.....	G. D. Humphrey
-------------------------------------	----------------

CANADA

Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia.....	F. W. Patterson
Mount Allison University, Sackville, New Brunswick	
	W. T. Ross Flemington
University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.....	G. Edward Hall
Victoria University, Toronto, Ontario.....	Walter T. Brown

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Universidad de Santo Domingo, Ciudad Trujillo.....	R. B. Burgos, <i>Secretary</i>
--	--------------------------------

China

Cheeloo University, Tsinan,.....	Wu K'E-Ming
Fukien Christian University, Foochow.....	Chan-Tung Kang
Ginling College, Nanking.....	Wu Yi-Fang
Hangchow Christian College, 353 Nanking Rd., Shanghai.....	Baen E. Lee
Hua Chung University, Wuchang.....	Francis C. M. Wei
Hwa Nan College, Foochow.....	Lucy C. Wang
Lingnan University, Canton.....	Y. L. Lee
University of Nanking, Nanking.....	Y. G. Chen
St. John's University, Jessfield Rd., Shanghai.....	Y. C. Tu
University of Shanghai, 85 Kiukiang Rd., Shanghai.....	Henry H. Lin
Soochow University, Quinsan Rd., Shanghai.....	Y. C. Yang
West China Union University, Chengtu.....	Fong Su-Hsuan
Yenching University, Peiping.....	William H. Adolph

Lebanon

American University of Beirut.....	Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr.
------------------------------------	----------------------------

HONORARY MEMBERS

American Association for the Advancement of Science
American Association of University Professors
American Association of University Women
American Council of Learned Societies
American Council on Education
Carnegie Corporation
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

National Protestant Council on Higher Education
General Education Board
Institute of International Education
Jesuit Educational Association
National Catholic Educational Association
Social Science Research Council
Southern Education Foundation
United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa
United States Office of Education

CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, INCORPORATED

ARTICLE I

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Association shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges of liberal arts and sciences which shall become members of this Association, and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions included in its membership.

ARTICLE II

The name of this Association shall be the "Association of American Colleges, Incorporated."

ARTICLE III

MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. The membership of the Association shall be composed of those colleges of liberal arts and sciences which may be duly elected to membership in the Association after recommendation by the Board of Directors.

SECTION 2. Honorary Membership.—The general secretaries of church boards of education and officials of educational foundations and other cooperating agencies may be elected to honorary membership.

ARTICLE IV

REPRESENTATION

Every institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to representation in each meeting of the Association by an accredited representative. Other members of the faculty or board of trustees of any institution belonging to this Association, the officers of church boards cooperating with such an institution and the representatives of foundations and other cooperating agencies, shall be entitled to all the privileges of representatives except the right to vote. Each institution recognized

as a member of the Association shall be entitled to one vote on any question before the Association, the vote to be cast by its accredited representative.

ARTICLE V

FIELD OF OPERATION

SECTION 1. The territory in which the operations of the Association are principally to be conducted is the United States.

ARTICLE VI

OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The Association shall elect from its membership the following:

1. President
2. Vice-President
3. Executive Director
4. Treasurer

SECTION 2. The Executive Director shall be the executive officer of the Association and shall serve until his successor is duly elected. The other officers shall serve for one year or until their successors are duly elected. Election of officers shall be by ballot.

SECTION 3. The duties of the respective officers shall be those usually connected with said offices.

ARTICLE VII

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SECTION 1. The Board of Directors shall consist of eight members, four of whom shall be elected by ballot by the Association, and the other four shall consist of the officers of the Association.

SECTION 2. The President of the Association shall be *ex officio* chairman of the Board of Directors.

SECTION 3. Except as provided by statute and as directed by the members of the Association, and subject to the Constitution and By-Laws, the Board of Directors shall have power to manage, operate and direct the affairs of the Association and fill all vacancies.

ARTICLE VIII**QUORUM**

Representatives of twenty-five members of the Association shall be necessary to form a quorum for the transaction of business.

ARTICLE IX**BY-LAWS**

The Association may enact By-Laws for its own government, not inconsistent with the provisions hereof and the certificate of incorporation.

ARTICLE X**AMENDMENTS**

Amendments to the foregoing Constitution may be offered at any regular annual meeting, and shall be in writing, signed by the mover and two seconds. They shall then lie on the table until the next annual meeting, and shall require for their adoption the affirmative vote of two thirds of the members then present.

BY-LAWS

1. Applications for membership shall be made to the Board of Directors, which shall, after investigation of the standing of the institution, recommend to the Association.

2. The annual dues shall be seventy-five dollars (\$75.00) per member. Non-payment of dues for two successive years shall cause forfeiture of membership.

3. At least one meeting of the Association shall be held in the month of January of each calendar year. Special meetings may be called by the Board of Directors, provided that four-weeks' notice in writing be given each institution connected with the Association.

4. The place of the annual meeting of the Association shall be determined each year by the Board of Directors.

5. All expenditure of funds of the Association shall be authorized by resolution of the Association, or subject to later approval by the Association, by the Board of Directors.

6. The President shall appoint a Committee on Resolutions at the beginning of each annual meeting, to which shall be referred for consideration and recommendation all special resolutions offered by members of the Association.

7. There shall be within the Association a permanent commission to be known as the "National Commission on Christian Higher Education." This Commission shall have such autonomy as may be necessary in order to represent the interests of church-related colleges in general and to carry on a program of promoting spiritual values in higher education. The Commission is to operate under rules mutually agreed to by the Commission and the Board of Directors.

8. The Executive Director shall mail three copies of all official bulletins to all institutions which are members of the Association. Additional copies, either for the institution or for any officer or faculty member, may be had at a special rate.

9. These By-Laws may be amended at any business session of the Association by two thirds vote, provided that notice of the proposed amendment has been presented at a previous session.

POLICY

In accordance with the action of the Association, the working policy of the Association is a policy of *inclusiveness and inter-helpfulness rather than of exclusiveness.*

FORMER PRESIDENTS

- 1915 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College; *Constitution adopted*
- 1915-16 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College
- 1916-17 President Henry Churchill King,* Oberlin College
- 1917-18 President John S. Nollen, Lake Forest College
President Hill M. Bell,* Drake University, *Vice-President, pre-*
siding
- 1918-19 President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College
- 1919-20 President William A. Shanklin,* Wesleyan University
- 1920-21 President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College
- 1921-22 President Clark W. Chamberlain, Denison University
- 1922-23 President Charles A. Richmond,* Union College
President Samuel Plantz,* Lawrence College, *Vice-President pre-*
siding
- 1923-24 President Harry M. Gage, Coe College
- 1924-25 Chancellor J. H. Kirkland,* Vanderbilt University
- 1925-26 President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College
- 1926-27 Dean John R. Effinger,* University of Michigan
- 1927-28 President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College
- 1928-29 President Trevor Arnett, General Education Board
- 1929-30 President Guy E. Snavely, Birmingham-Southern College
- 1930-31 Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University
- 1931-32 President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College
- 1932-33 President Irving Maurer,* Beloit College
- 1933-34 President Edmund D. Soper, Ohio Wesleyan University
- 1934-35 President William Mather Lewis,* Lafayette College
- 1935-36 President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College
- 1936-37 President James R. McCain, Agnes Scott College
- 1937-38 President, James L. McConaughy*, Wesleyan University
- 1938-39 President John L. Seaton, Albion College
- 1939-40 President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College
- 1940-41 President Edward V. Stanford, Villanova College
- 1941-42 President Remsen D. Bird, Occidental College
- 1942-43 President Charles E. Diehl, Southwestern
- 1943-44 Chancellor William P. Tolley, Syracuse University
- 1944-45 President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University
- 1945-46 President James P. Baxter, III, Williams College
- 1946-47 President Charles J. Turek, Macalester College
- 1947-48 President Mildred McAfee Horton, Wellesley College

* Deceased.

EDITORIAL NOTES

BY VOTE OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS THE ASSOCIATION WILL HOLD ITS NEXT ANNUAL MEETING AT THE HOTEL COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 10-12, 1949.

SCIENTISTS STARRED 1903-1943 is a comprehensive volume of over 500 pages, dealing with more than 2600 scientists who were judged by their compeers as outstanding. The book is concerned with their educational and other background influences. Each group of scientists (grouping being determined by date of being starred) is listed by departments of science, and by place of birth, collegiate and advanced training, and place of employment. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.

THROUGH GOLDEN YEARS is a history of Centenary College (New Jersey) published for the seventy-fifth anniversary, by Leila Roberta Custard. It not only supplies a wealth of material on this one institution of higher learning, but through this history gives an additional insight into the educational trends of this particular period. Lewis Historical Publishing Company, Inc., New York.

HOUSE ON THE HILL, published by the Centennial Committee of Rockford College, is a collection of poems by Abbie Findlay Potts—a tribute to, and graphic history of the first one hundred years of Rockford College.

A HISTORY OF BOSTON COLLEGE by David R. Dunigan, S.J., fills a gap in the material available for general use on the development of American Catholic higher education. In performing this function the book covers the problems and achievements of all institutions of which it is typical in many respects, in addition to setting forth the challenging story of this particular college in its adjustment to factors peculiar to the Boston environment. Of considerable reference value and educational interest are the details of the controversy concerning "Secular vs. Jesuit Education." The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee.

BASIC GUIDANCE is the first of a series of Nebraska Guidance Bulletins—a 70-page pamphlet. It contains suggestions for Nebraska Schools, it has been published by the State of Nebraska Department of Vocational Education, and is designed to help superintendents and teachers with their problems of guidance services.

SOME TASKS FOR EDUCATION is by Sir Richard Livingstone, President of Corpus Christi College and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford. This volume gives the author's opinion on such basic questions as what type of education is needed for the modern world, how to improve ourselves and our society by education, the neglect of character training, the problem of creating a civilized democracy and how men can be trained in the virtues of candor and impartiality. Oxford University Press, New York.

CAREY THOMAS OF BRYN MAWR, by Edith Finch, is the biography of an indomitable woman, President of Bryn Mawr for nearly thirty years, who helped to set the pattern of modern women in America. Born into a Quaker family noted for its long line of strong-willed, capable women, Carey Thomas early resolved to gain an education "as good as any man's" in a day when women were commonly refused admission to the eastern universities. This work sketches Miss Carey's own educational triumphs at Cornell, Johns Hopkins and the universities of Leipzig and Zurich; and vividly describes her contribution to the growth of education for women in the United States. Harper & Brothers, New York.

THE FIRST FIFTEEN YEARS OF THE COLLEGE OF ST. SCHOLASTICA is a well-organized and readable account of the results of a study of its alumnae made by the college administrators. The study was made on the basis of a questionnaire sent to all alumnae of the years 1926 to 1941. The questions dealt with the opinions and beliefs of the former students on a variety of topics, what they were doing with their time and what goals they had set for themselves. The formulation of questions and the reception of responses to them had the effect of

clarifying the problems and objectives of the faculty and staff and making possible a more accurate evaluation of the college's success in attaining these objectives. Many changes in curriculum have been introduced as a result of the survey. The Declan X. McMullen Co., New York.

THE NATURE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS, by John E. Wise, S.J., is a study of just what constitutes the nature of the liberal arts and why they are essential to the proper education and the full development of man. For proof the author reverts to history and to the great writers who were recognized exponents of liberal education. The concluding chapters summarize each of the three essentials in the nature of the liberal arts and apply these concepts to the problems of modern education. The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee.

FIFTY FACTS ABOUT BRITAIN'S ECONOMIC POSITION is the name of a 19-page leaflet recently put out by the British Information Services. Copies may be obtained from Neville Gardiner, B.I.S., 907-15th Street N.W., Washington 5, D. C.

MUSIC AND WOMEN, by Sophie Drinker, is a scholarly and highly readable history of the participation of women in music, and it is also a book which has wide general interest and social significance. In assembling all the information pertinent to the relation of women to music, the art which releases the deepest subconscious, Mrs. Drinker illumines wide range of history and plumbs depths of social and individual experience. Though the book has a specific importance for musicians and a special interest for women, it is full of stimulating and challenging ideas about men and for men. Coward-McCann, Inc., New York.

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND'S LARGEST CITY, has been host since last September to seventy American college students who have been pursuing courses in German language and literature, economics, history, government, art and music, under the direction of the Junior Year in Zurich. This organization is sponsored by the American Council on College Study in

Switzerland. The program of study is conducted with the co-operation of officials of the Swiss Government, and in arrangement with the various institutions of higher learning in Zurich, including the University of Zurich, The Federal Institute of Technology, the Volkshochschule, and the Swiss Institute of International Studies.

The aims of the Junior Year in Zurich are twofold. First, it hopes by means of environment to make it possible for the student to obtain a more fundamental grasp of the German language. The advantages of a native environment speak for themselves, although one should add that the maximum benefits can be obtained only after a student has had two years of preparatory training in college.

Second, the sponsors of the Junior Year in Zurich feel that a year abroad offers an excellent opportunity to students in the sense that they are given the chance to become acquainted with a cultural pattern which, though related to the American, is nevertheless distinctly different. At the same time, the student has stepped out of his own familiar milieu and is thus in a position where he can scrutinize it in a more objective manner. In a few words, then, it is hoped that the cultural horizons of American students may be widened because it is these wider cultural horizons which can become the seedbeds for the growth of understanding, co-operation, and peace among the nations.

When they have completed their two semesters at the University of Zurich the students will return to the United States next summer. Having received credit for their Junior Year abroad they will then be ready for the senior year at their home college.

Because of the many students who have indicated a strong interest in this program, especially G.I. students many of whom have already been abroad, the American Council on College Study in Switzerland is planning to sponsor two Junior Year groups for the 1948-49 academic year. One group will study at the University of Zurich, the other at the University of Basel.

The American address of the Junior Year in Zurich is 1123 North Eutaw Street, Baltimore 1, Maryland. The Zurich address is Zeltweg 4, Zurich 32. Dr. Edmund E. Miller is the Director.

COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS IN THE HUMANITIES by Edward Safford Jones is on our bookshelves again and will be sold for one dollar as long as the supply lasts. The questions are used in senior terminal examinations in the classics, English, modern languages, philosophy, art.

ARCHITECTURAL PLANNING OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE by J. Fredrick Larson and Archie M. Palmer, presenting developments in architecture with special reference to the small college, attainment of character in college architecture and problems involved in campus development, can now be purchased from the Association office for one dollar.

THE SCARLET LETTER by Nathaniel Hawthorne is now available in a pocket-size edition at 50 cents. This is the first of a series in a new publishing venture called the Rinehart Editions. Standard classics, comprising a wide selection, are being chosen for reprint in clear, readable text printed on good paper and paper-covered. The introduction to each work will relate to its cultural and intellectual milieu and to its place in the author's development, as well as the influences it has had. There is no single copy sale of these books; they may be ordered from the College Department of Rinehart & Company, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York 16.

SOcial PROBLEMS ON THE HOME FRONT by Francis E. Merrill, professor of sociology at Dartmouth, focuses upon the social disorganization resulting from World War II. Nine chapters of the book take up successively the problems of war and social change, family disorganization, childhood, adolescence, sex offenses, prostitution, delinquency, crime, and personal disorganization. All the headings covered represent a first-hand study of some of the conditions prevalent during the war; a final chapter is devoted to summary and conclusions. Harper & Brothers, New York.

TOWARD GENERAL EDUCATION by Earl J. McGrath & Others is a 224-page book, the purpose of which is set forth by its authors in the foreword: "The student as future citizen

was the point of departure in all our thinking (in discussions leading to the writing of the book). . . we have accepted the infinitely varied student body which American social philosophy, for better or for worse, has sent into the colleges. We have attempted (to produce) a program of general education adaptable to the needs of all these college students. . . . The title of this volume, however, reveals our conviction that much experimentation, systematic appraisal of the results, and readjustment in the light of tested experience must occur before the purposes of general education can be achieved in American democracy." The Macmillan Co., New York.

A HISTORY OF MACMURRAY COLLEGE is a thick volume by Dr. Mary Watters, research editor of the Illinois State Historical Library. President McClelland, in a foreword to the book, says that "Dr. Watters was given a free hand. . . . It is possible that not everyone will approve of (her) interpretations; however, there can be no question that she wrote without conscious bias. It is certain that the history will be of absorbing interest to alumnae. . . . (and) it is hoped that others. . . . will find the book of value as an historical document and inspiring as an adventure in the higher education of women."

THE TESTING OFFICES of the College Entrance Examination Board, the Graduate Record Office of the Carnegie Foundation, and the American Council on Education (including the Cooperative Test Service and the ACE Psychological Examination) have been merged to form a new non-profit organization, the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Each of the parent organizations has assigned to the ETS the greater part of its current assets; in addition, the Carnegie Corporation of New York has made to the ETS a grant of \$750,000. The formation of the ETS leaves unaffected the non-testing activities of the parent organizations. The ETS aims first of all to coordinate, strengthen and improve the testing services of its three constituent groups. Basic to this end are the exploration of undeveloped areas in the field of educational testing, the development of new tests as needed, and the carrying out of fundamental research. In addition, emphasis will be placed on advisory ser-

vices to schools and colleges, for the most effective use of test resources and results. The ETS will also serve as a unified technical or operating agency which can, on request, supply testing and measurement services to the Government or to other groups.

The new organization is governed by a Board of Trustees consisting of twelve members, chosen to represent all levels and types of American educational institutions. Offices of the ETS will be maintained in New York City; Princeton, New Jersey; Berkeley, California; and eventually in other parts of the country. At present, inquiries may best be addressed to the Educational Testing Service, Box 592, Princeton, New Jersey.

HENCEFORTH ALL ACTIVITIES of the Association, except those of the Arts Program will center in Washington. Mail concerning the Arts Program should continue to be addressed to 19 W. 44 Street, New York 18, N. Y. All other communications should be sent to 726 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C.

AMONG THE COLLEGES

BATES COLLEGE has reached the goal of \$450,000 for the College's Library-Common Fund.

BIRMINGHAM-SOUTHERN COLLEGE and **HOWARD COLLEGE**, both located in Birmingham, Alabama, have recently completed a joint campaign for funds that resulted in the raising of more than \$1,000,000 from the citizens of the city of Birmingham. The two colleges expect to raise \$1,200,000 elsewhere in the state in order to receive a contingent gift of \$300,000 from the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY has announced that the School of Theology Building Fund has reached \$719,267, thus satisfying the requirement to raise \$666,666.66 by January 1, 1948. President Daniel L. Marsh said that this puts the Building Fund "over the top," for the University will now receive an additional one-third of a million dollars which had been conditionally promised by the Crusade for Christ Fund of the Methodist Church. Construction will be commenced early in 1948.

BOWDOIN COLLEGE secured a gift of \$100,000 from trustee Harvey D. Gibson to the Sesquicentennial Fund on condition that the other trustees and overseers pledge a total of at least \$400,000. This total has now been oversubscribed and the College has thus accomplished its first step in a plan to raise \$3,025,000 in the next two years for additional building and salary needs.

CLAREMONT MEN'S COLLEGE has been made the recipient of a \$5,000 research fund from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. This stipend will be used by the Men's College to further the study of economic problems in the San Gabriel Valley. The grant developed out of a number of conferences held last year by the College with business and government leaders in the area. These conferences were held in co-operation with the Committee on Economic Development, when the future economic

outlook of the region, the industrial relations problems in the area, and the status of manufacturing in Southern California were discussed.

EARLHAM COLLEGE received a gift of \$40,000 from Orville Wright before his death.

HARVARD COLLEGE was willed \$5,000,000 by the late Thomas W. Lamont.

HOLLINS COLLEGE has received a gift of \$54,550 in securities to augment faculty salaries. The donor is Mrs. Alfred I. du Pont, member of the Hollins College Board of Trustees.

KENYON COLLEGE will open, in the summer of 1948, a summer school for graduate students called The Kenyon School of English. The College will again accord graduate credit toward earned degrees for secular work—a practice discontinued about 15 years ago. The teaching Fellows of the Kenyon School of English have been chosen from the eminent writers, critics, and literary scholars of America and England. Most of them are presently serving on the faculties of distinguished colleges and graduate schools.

NORWICH UNIVERSITY held a National Defense Conference on February 12, 1948 at which the speakers were: The Honorable Charles A. Plumley, Member of Congress from Vermont; General J. Lawton Collins, Deputy Chief of Staff, United States Army; Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy; General Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force; The Honorable Robert Cutler, President of the Old Colony Trust Company, Boston.

OSBERLIN COLLEGE was included among the bequests of Orville Wright, to the extent of \$300,000.

PARK COLLEGE has recently received bequests totaling \$100,000. From the estate of U. W. Sidebottom the college has received \$60,000 for the building and equipping of a student

union building for which an additional \$20,000 must be raised to meet the terms of the gift. The estate of Mrs. Frederick L. Wells has granted the college \$40,000 which is specifically provided as endowment, the income to be used for scholarships or payment of salaries.

PHILANDER SMITH COLLEGE announces capital funds gifts during the past 12 months totaling \$186,000. Of this amount a total of \$71,000 comes from the General Education Board of New York City; \$50,000 from the Annual Conferences (Negro) of the St. Louis Area, presided over by Bishop E. W. Kelly; and \$15,000 from alumni and friends for the Memorial Alumni Loan Fund. The College is in a campaign for \$1,000,000 by January 1, 1951.

PHILLIPS UNIVERSITY has voted for a new campus plan which will call for seven new buildings—a Science Hall costing \$350,000; a Bible College Building costing \$500,000, two-thirds of which is finished; a Fine Arts Building; an enlargement of the Library to three times its present size; an Administration Building; several Classroom Buildings and an Auditorium. Money is now available for the first five buildings listed.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY has announced a grant of \$100,000 made to its Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

UNION COLLEGE (New York) will receive \$200,000 under the terms of the will of the late Thomas W. Lamont.

UNIVERSITY OF CHATTANOOGA has been presented with gifts totaling \$50,000 by Dr. John B. Haskins, Chattanooga physician, in memory of his son, an alumnus of the university. Because young John B. Haskins died of rheumatic fever—a disease concerning which little is known—the major portion of the gift will go into endowment for support of science instruction and research.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA has recently received three bequests of \$50,000 each, two from the estates of former Philadelphia citizens, and one from Ohio.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH has recently received an award of \$250,000 towards its new building program from the Sarah Mellon Scaife Foundation.

UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH (Sewanee) has received a gift of \$51,350 in securities which will be put in the permanent endowment fund. The income will be used to increase faculty salaries.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA announces the receipt of a gift in excess of \$100,000 from an anonymous donor who stated he had been inspired by the recent example of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Rector of the University, who set up the Stettinius Fund, Inc. with a donation in excess of \$100,000.

NEW COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

- American University of Beirut, Lebanon. Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr., budgetary adviser, office of Secretary of National Defense.
- Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio. Glen L. Clayton, professor of history, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Baylor University, Waco, Texas. W. R. White, president, Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Texas.
- Bethany-Peniel College, Bethany, Oklahoma. Roy H. Cantrell.
- Brothers College, Drew University, Madison, New Jersey. F. G. Hollaway, dean, Drew Theological Seminary.
- Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Illinois. Henry W. Dinkmeyer.
- Glenville State College, Glenville, West Virginia. Harry B. Heflin, professor of elementary education, Marshall College, Huntington, West Virginia.
- Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio. W. Terry Wickham, superintendent of schools, Hamilton, Ohio.
- Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, New York. Alan W. Brown.
- Hood College, Frederick, Maryland. Andrew G. Truxal, professor, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.
- John B. Stetson University, Deland, Florida. J. Ollie Edmunds.
- New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, State College, New Mexico, John R. Nichols.
- St. Mary's University, San Antonio, Texas. Louis J. Blume.
- Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri. William W. Hall, Jr., president, College of Idaho, Caldwell, Idaho.
- Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio. Charles L. Hill.
- University of Alabama, University, Alabama. John M. Gallalee, professor, University of Alabama.
- University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire.
- Arthur S. Adams, provost, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.
- University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico. Tom L. Popejoy, comptroller.
- University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio. Wilbur W. White, dean of graduate school, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
- York College, York, Nebraska. Walter E. Bachman.